

## TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS (L)

Roy V. Dudley  
Oscar A. Johnson  
Joseph Mazzotta

Albert C. Gross  
Palmer S. Midgett

## TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

James R. Orndorff, Jr.  
Thomas R. Nan Carrow

## POSTMASTERS

## GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart.  
Lucie D. Woodall, Brookhaven.  
John E. Jones, Lula.  
Miriam Dickerson, Rabun Gap.  
Hugh W. Williams, Red Oak.  
Charlie C. Parson, Watkinsville.

## MARYLAND

James F. Cohee, Middle River.  
Henry J. Norris, Whiteford.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Myrtie L. McLoon, North Truro.

## VIRGINIA

Jessie M. Cross, Concord Depot.  
Albert W. Horton, Raven.  
George Washington, Woodford.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 20, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven and in every manifestation of living nature, we turn our thoughts to Thee with the approach of these sacred moments. Thou art now here; we regret that we are not better. Forgive us, dear Lord, and give us another chance. So strengthen us that we shall avoid that which impairs the tenderness of conscience, obscures the sense of God, or takes the inspiration from spiritual things. We thank Thee for all our hopes and for the delight in sweet anticipations. Enable us to labor patiently, accept discipline willingly, and do our work as men strong, brave, and true. Let us yield ourselves to the Spirit Divine, who gives vision, freshness, and bestows blessings richly to enjoy. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 19, 1939.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The powers conferred by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, dealing with the stabilization fund, and the powers specified in paragraph (b) (2) of section 43, title III, of the act approved May 12, 1933, as amended, relating to the fixing of the metallic content of the dollar, will expire on June 30, 1939.

The existence of these powers has enabled us to safeguard the Nation's interests and to carry forward international monetary and economic cooperation. It is obvious, however, that the international monetary and economic situation is still such that it would not be safe to permit such powers to be terminated. I believe the sound and wise policy to pursue under the circumstances is to extend these powers until January 15, 1941.

The Secretary of the Treasury and other representatives of the Treasury Department will be available to discuss with the appropriate committees of Congress the problems relating to such legislation.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. W. B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address of Culbert L. Olson, the Governor of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given 3 more days for the formation and submission of my remarks on the W. P. A. appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on last evening our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] delivered an address over the air on the subject War Hysteria and National Defense. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein the speech of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous permission of the House to address the House for 30 minutes next Monday on the Gold Reserve Act, after the disposition of regular matters that may be on the Speaker's table and the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

## GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Washington which is represented in this House by my colleagues and myself has attained the age of 50 years.

We are celebrating our State's fiftieth anniversary by designating the year 1939 as "Washington's Golden Jubilee Year."

Our State proudly bears the name of the Father of his Country, "Washington." In the 50 years since the Congress of the United States passed enabling legislation for the territory of Washington to become the State of Washington, we have had a most marvelous growth and development, and we have forged ahead until today we stand in the forefront among the great progressive States of this Union.

Within the confines of our State, we have former residents of every other State in the Union, and we are conscious of the great debt of gratitude we owe those pioneers whose intrepid spirit carried them across the wide-open spaces and caused them to endure the hardships incident to reaching the most northwest corner of this great Nation. These

pioneers came, not only prepared to perform the difficult tasks of building a great State in a physical way, but they brought with them those fine spiritual and intellectual qualities that have meant so much to our State in its marvelous development and growth. The best ideas in the field of political, social, and economic science of the older States were here brought together, and as result we find the State that bears the revered name of Washington, occupying a high place among its sister States and reflecting honor, glory, and credit upon that great American after whom it was named. Let me predict that the accomplishments in the half century since our State was born will prove small by comparison with those that we shall see in this wonderful State during the next 50 years.

Without in the slightest attempting to detract from the distinction and the credit due any of her sister States, the young State of Washington feels that it can with just pride point to its own accomplishments in face of the fact that it is but one-third as old as the National Congress itself, which is this year celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary.

Our legislature has just recently assembled in its regular biennial session and this body has the unusual distinction of having in its membership more native-born sons and daughters than any previous legislature in the State's history, there being 50 members of the present legislature who were born, reared, and educated in the State, a number exactly corresponding to the number of years that mark the existence of the State. It has the further distinction of having as its chief executive a native-born son whose knowledge of the State, pride in its accomplishments, and love for it are not surpassed by anyone.

The Honorable Clarence D. Martin, our Governor, upon the convening of the legislature in Olympia, Wash., on January 11 of this year, preceding the delivery of his message to the legislature, delivered to that body and to the citizenship of the State of Washington a proclamation, proclaiming the year of 1939 "Washington's Golden Jubilee Year." [Applause.] It affords me an honor and pleasure to make that remarkable address a part of the permanent records of this Congress by including it in these remarks. The address is as follows:

#### GOLDEN JUBILEE ADDRESS

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, senators and representatives, and you, my fellow citizens, who have pride and faith in our great State of Washington, 50 years ago our beloved State of Washington was born.

So today, in honor of that memorable event, and with profound gratitude to the parents and their pioneering neighbors who made possible the things we now have and enjoy, I should like to speak briefly of the progress and future of our distinctive Commonwealth before presenting my formal message on the condition of the State and its government.

Some of our splendid elderly citizens remember July 4, 1889, when 75 sturdy, purposeful pioneers gathered here in Olympia to draft a constitution for a new State. They worked long and hard, differing and disputing, as men will, but they were inspired by the same purpose, and they finally accomplished it—a constitution for a State of the highest principles of Americanism and democracy, a charter that declared Washington forever to be the abiding place of spiritual freedom, tolerance, charity, and good will. This document was ratified wholeheartedly by the people on October 1, 1889. Then, on November 11, 1889, President Benjamin Harrison proclaimed Washington a sovereign State, and 300,000 men, women, and children rejoiced, and joyful celebrations were held in the then distant Spokane area, amid the rolling hills of the Palouse and Walla Walla, in the still unreclaimed valleys of Yakima, Chelan, and Okanogan; in the sparse settlements of Vancouver and the Columbia River, and all up and down the evergreen slopes and the lowlands of the Puget Sound country. And so, my friends, with pride and confidence, and with the cheering shouts of the pioneers, Washington took a place in the great cavalcade of American States.

Today we may proudly agree that Washington kept faith and measurably fulfilled the hopes and dreams of her founding pioneers, and kept pace with the most progressive of her sister States.

In 1889, a backwoods territory of straggling settlements—the lawmakers plodding along mud-splashed paths to meet in dimly lighted frame buildings.

In 1939, a proud State of 1,600,000 spirited Americans, a State of importance in industry, agriculture, commerce, and culture, a solid cornerstone of the United States—her legislators, you men and women who should glow with pride, meeting in a \$14,000,000

capitol that is outranked by no State capitol in the Union, working in two legislative chambers that are not excelled by any legislative halls in the world.

Today, Washington stands first in the production of lumber; foremost in the production of wheat, dairy and poultry commodities, quality fruits and other products of the earth, the fields, and the hills.

Today, Washington has the finest of highway systems—modern, broad highways running into every part of the State, overcoming mountains, bringing remote communities near to all.

Today, Washington stands foremost in citizenship and culture—first in public education, high-school pupils, literacy, and literature reading.

And today, as always, the people of Washington need not yield to any State, region, or group of people in devotion to the ideals of Americanism, loyalty, tolerance, good will, and unshamed respect and reverence for religion and the things that are God's.

But such a remarkable record of progress within the span of 50 years should not, and must not, be ascribed only to human minds and human hands. Nature provided an exceptionally favorable setting for this noteworthy progress. Rugged snow-capped mountains, clear tumbling streams, sky-blue lakes, deep and calm landlocked salt waters, rolling hills, timbered hillsides, rustic countryside—all yielding abundantly of their peculiar products, yielding enchantment and inspiration, and a healthy environment for all. Our climate is ideal, devoid of extreme temperatures. So far we have no reason to fear elemental devastation—no earthquakes crumple our buildings, no tornadoes twist and carry away our homes, no hailstorms destroy our crops. Truly, because of Nature's kindness, everyday life is more pleasant in Washington.

My friends, we might easily leave these things go unnoticed, but it is manifestly appropriate that this record of progress and the blessings of Providence should be noted and observed. Therefore, as Governor, I am proud to proclaim this year of 1939, which marks the fiftieth anniversary of statehood, as golden jubilee year in the State of Washington.

I suggest, too, that this legislature should set aside a day for a joint session to formally open the golden jubilee observance, not only for your own inspiration, but as an example and incentive for all public authorities and good citizens to hold similar observances in their respective jurisdictions and communities. It might be well, if you decide on a session of commemoration, that you make some recognition of the 50 native sons and daughters among you—the largest number of born Washingtonians to ever sit in our legislature. I do not make this suggestion without heartfelt appreciation of the pioneers and other members of this legislature, but simply because a recognition of the native members might tend to impress our young people with the fact that they are of the first native generation to fully inherit this rich, unlimited heritage that is Washington, and the responsibility of developing and protecting it.

Moreover, all of us might well make it a point to invite friends and good citizens of all parts of the country, and especially our neighbors of British Columbia, Idaho, Oregon, and California to visit us sometime during the year of the golden jubilee—not only to enjoy the hospitality of an open-hearted citizenship, but also that they, too, may realize that it is indeed a privilege to live, and build, and grow in the State of Washington.

We should realize, and those who come to see us should know, that great as our progress has been, Washington's full bloom and glory still are ahead of us, that her destiny still is in the building. We have timber to cut, valleys to irrigate, minerals to mine, raw materials to process, commerce to expand, cheap electric power to utilize, Grand Coulee, Columbia Basin, Bonneville, Skagit, Roza. In fact, we have all the essentials to the building of a Washington far beyond the dreams of the pioneers—a Washington of still greater blessings to all of us who are so fortunate to live within her borders.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY, Mr. LEMKE, and Mr. THORKELSON asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and some remarks of certain members of the Government of Puerto Rico in regard to the sugar tariff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

#### FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL, 1939

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, the first deficiency appropriation bill, fiscal year 1939; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue for 40 minutes, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2868, the first deficiency bill, fiscal year 1939, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is not surprising that there is some criticism of this bill as reported. It is seldom that any of the committees of the House bring in reports on any measure that meet with unanimous approval or adopt any conclusion on which there is complete accord. Regardless of what committee it is or the subject on which it reports, there are always some who take the position that the committee is either blocking the wheels of progress, or, on the other hand, driving headlong to national catastrophe, as the case may be. In that respect, the Committee on Appropriations is no exception to the rule. As a matter of fact, the Appropriations Committee has perhaps the most difficult task of any of the committees of the House in that it deals in cash, money on the barrel head, and there is no community or State or industry that is not sometime during the session an applicant, directly or indirectly, for allotments from the Federal Treasury, or their equivalent. As a result, it frequently gets to the point where Members or groups of Members feel that they are collectively discriminated against or personally aggrieved because they have been denied appropriations the committee was not in position to approve, and so for that reason I wish here this afternoon, at the beginning of the session, before we take up the regular supply bills, to make the plea that was carried on a sign in one of the popular and turbulent dance halls of the West in pioneer days: "Don't shoot the fiddler. He is doing the best he can."

I hope Members will not hold it too much against the Committee on Appropriations when it cannot approve all requests and amendments, and that they will remember that the committee is in a very difficult position and is "doing the best it can."

In drafting the supply bills the Committee on Appropriations is between two fires. On one hand, we have the departments every year asking for more money and wider jurisdiction. We have in practically every estimate received from the departments an exemplification of the omnipresent human trait which magnifies the importance of its own work, and which constantly reaches out for new fields and broader administration. There are no exceptions to the rule.

In every department of the Government, bureaus and divisions are asking more money, larger staffs, and additional projects.

Every year, with every supply bill, the regular establishments grow more complex and reach out into fields undreamed of a decade ago. Every year the cost increases.

I have often heard the opinion expressed by experienced Members on both sides of the House that in every supply bill there are millions of dollars that could be saved. Undoubtedly that is true. For as the departments branch out and take on new duties, they also cling tenaciously to all the old activities and expenditures. For example—an extreme one, perhaps, but significant of the trend—we formerly maintained a veterinary department here in the District of Columbia.

It was before the days of motorization, and all street and refuse work was handled by draft animals, and naturally we had to have a veterinary department, to look after them. Those horses and mules disappeared long ago in the van of the motors and trucks and tractors, which took over their tasks, but for many years afterward we still maintained a veterinary department to service horses and mules which had passed on to the Elysian fields.

LXXXIV—37

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House that the Appropriations Committee, knowing those facts, being familiar with the facts, brought in a bill providing for veterinarians to care for mules, when there were no mules?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They did. That was when our former colleague, Mr. Simmons, of Nebraska, from the gentleman's side of the House, was chairman of the committee. When we came in we cut it out. [Laughter.]

Mr. MICHENER. It is encouraging to know that the gentleman has accomplished something.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was not much of an accomplishment to improve on a record like that. Other instances could be cited. But there is another phase that should be noted. The departments are resourceful in keeping old activities and acquiring new functions. They are in touch with organizations over the country, most of them beneficiaries, which respond aggressively when an old appropriation is to be defended or a new appropriation secured. We had an amusing instance of this just a year or two ago when a sudden flood of letters and telegrams demanded appropriations for the establishment of "eccological" stations. So effective was the barrage that Members rushed in on the floor from all sides waving telegrams and demanding that the Union be saved. For the time it seemed that the amendment would be carried practically unanimously. The only thing that prevented what later proved would have been an unwise expenditure was that the committee asked the proponents of the amendment what "eccological" stations were and as none of them could define the word or explain the use of such stations, support of the amendment collapsed. Such demands from all sections of the country, prompted by grapevine directions from Washington, feature the consideration of practically every major appropriation bill brought up in the House. When analyzed, Members will find that such pressure telegrams and letters do not represent any appreciable sentiment in their districts and certainly do not justify raids on the Treasury against the carefully considered report of the committee which has studied the question for months, and has allowed every dollar the activity is entitled to receive.

Now, on the other side we have our colleagues asking for appropriations in which their constituencies are interested. I think the most difficult duty devolving on a committee is the denial of the request of a colleague. We always do so with reluctance. It would be much pleasanter to comply with the wishes of our friends and go along. In fact so trying is the unwelcome necessity of saying no that when a bill is finally reported you can be certain that if the committee has made any mistakes at all, it has erred on the side of prodigality rather than parsimony. And I would like to emphasize this one thing—here at the beginning of the session, before the supply bills come in and before any Member takes a position either one way or the other on items in these bills, I would like to ask you to guard against that old fallacy that the advisability of making an appropriation depends upon whether the money would be well expended.

You can justify almost any expenditure on that ground. You can show that the purpose for which it is to be expended is a laudable one and that it will serve a great need and result in immeasurable benefits to the country. But that is not the question. We have only so much money to spend. The income of the Government is fixed and definite. When we spend for one purpose that means we must take it away from some other purpose. We must write our appropriations to conform to the amount available for expenditure. We must cut the coat to the cloth. So the question is not whether the money would be well invested or whether the purpose for which it is to be expended is a desirable one. The one question to be considered is that among all the purposes for which

we must appropriate, is the appropriation in question more desirable than others demanding consideration. We cannot look at each appropriation solely from its own point of view. We must look at the National Budget as a whole. And the problem which confronts the Appropriation Committee on every proposal is whether it fits into the picture or whether the money should be put to some other use for which there is more imperative need. It is wholly and solely a matter of relative need, and I hope our friends in the House will deal with us charitably and indulgently when, after due consideration, it seems to us that the money requested could be expended in some other way to better advantage. For that is the basic principle under which governments must operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman could let me have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sorry. The time has been fixed in the House. I would be delighted if the time were available.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak particularly relating to the hurricane in New England. Not many have taken the floor thus far relating to it. It is expected that amendments to this bill will be offered.

I am surprised to read this morning in the Washington Post, "House slashes storm funds in slap at Aiken," and that "members of the House Appropriations Committee said yesterday it was a spur to their 'economy-mindedness' in lopping off \$3,750,000."

From the debate on the floor of the House yesterday it seemed, indeed, to be a spur to cut this appropriation as a slap at Governor Aiken or the New England States.

I am reminded that last year when Governor Aiken slapped his own Republican Party for lack of liberality, he was a hero on the Democratic side of the House. I am exceedingly familiar with the taking of land for lighthouses and Coast Guard stations and for similar purposes of the Federal Government, and that jurisdiction was requested and that conditions were generally imposed by the States. It is not a new doctrine advanced by Governor Aiken and New England.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman be good enough to name the members of the Appropriations Committee who made the statement that any cut in this appropriation was aimed at Governor Aiken?

Mr. GIFFORD. I quoted the newspaper this morning. Shall I read it to you?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If it contains the name of any member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course it does not, but it reads "A squabble with Vermont's Governor Aiken over States' rights, members of the House Appropriations Committee said yesterday was a spur," and so forth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I say to the gentleman that no member of the Appropriations Committee made any such statement as that, either on or off the floor of the House.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will have to forgive me for bringing this up because the New England newspapers will copy that assertion.

I want to speak particularly of this hurricane problem. It has not been brought sufficiently to your attention. I live in the southeastern section of New England, much of which was engulfed by the tidal wave. You may have a serious forestry problem, but I have a tidal-wave problem, with resulting destruction that was perhaps much greater.

Have the States of New England contributed sufficiently? From the records it appears that—

Some 600 lives were lost. The American Red Cross places the deaths at 488, with 100 additional missing. The Red Cross found that 93,122 families suffered more or less serious property loss;

6,933 summer dwellings, 1,999 other dwellings, and 2,065 boats were destroyed—property estimated at between \$250,000,000 and \$330,000,000.

This bill carries \$3,000,000 for fire protection. You will notice that the total economic loss is estimated at \$330,000,000. Again from the record:

The loss of life has been greater in a few other hurricanes, but the property damage in that storm was the greatest that ever occurred in a single storm anywhere in the world.

The New England States, with all the available forces at their command, set immediately to work. Private citizens offered help in every manner possible. The National Guard of Massachusetts was in service for as much as a couple of weeks. The Massachusetts Legislature immediately bonded the State for \$19,000,000 to meet this emergency. We suffered tremendous property loss and damage. Several towns in my district find that the storm has reduced their assessed valuation from 20 to 30 percent. Their tax rates, consequently, will greatly increase. What a suggestion—"that Massachusetts and the New England States have not contributed sufficiently"! And if they receive any of this \$3,000,000 they will get it, if you please, only by matching the funds offered. We heard a recommendation yesterday that if \$6,000,000 of wheat was in danger of destruction by grasshoppers we should appropriate \$6,000,000 to kill grasshoppers. I am glad to vote to kill the grasshoppers—any reasonable amount for that. But do not use such funds to kill them on private property. That, at least, is your apparent position regarding fire hazards. New England is seemingly regarded a rich section. Never before in an emergency like this has money been appropriated in this manner? Ridiculous! Precedents are many, if, indeed, actual authorization under the law may have been lacking. We asked for \$8,700,000; the Budget reported \$5,000,000; the committee cut it down to \$3,000,000, with the provision that funds should be matched before a grant would be made. The Budget recommended an appropriation of \$5,000,000, stating that authority exists, as conditions were closely analogous to those which follow a major flood, earthquake, or other disaster creating a national emergency, and so on. Even foreign nations have received outright gifts in cases of disaster. But this happened in New England, the forgotten land of these days.

Is New England rich? The finger has been pointed at us often, and the assertion made that we were rich because of favorable action of Government relating to tariffs. What we do have is largely because of thrift—which is seemingly no longer regarded as a virtue. We sailed the seas, cultivated rocky soil, saved, and furnished the capital assets for much of the rest of the country. We are not asking unusual consideration. If lack of authorization is advanced at this time as an objection, let it be a precedent to be followed in the future for similar appropriations. Poor old New England! You hesitate to give her very much. You envy her apparent better general financial condition. You do not wish to accord her equal treatment. A Communist to his brother, "Fine weather." The other, "Yes, but the rich have it, too." [Laughter.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield. The gentleman is to offer an amendment, I understand.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, for I entertain for him the highest feeling of consideration and respect, but I wanted to make the observation that I think my friend does not want to leave the impression that even if other sections do not help New England today that we would not be big enough to help them if they had a similar problem tomorrow.

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly not, and they know we would. They know how much we love them. Why cannot they love us also?

Mr. RANKIN. We do.

Mr. GIFFORD. I desire to discuss this hurricane damage a little further that I may bring home to you some realiza-



tion of the damage wrought. In one instance a colony of 15 or 20 acres covered with small summer homes was entirely demolished. If it had happened 2 weeks previous, when occupied by its summer visitors, the loss of life would have been appalling. The tidal wave came suddenly, and one house buffeting against another, left nothing but kindling wood over the entire acreage. The W. P. A. could come in and clear the streets, and the \$19,000,000 appropriated by the State would take care of the roads and bridges destroyed. But how about the private individuals who lose the larger portion of the \$330,000,000? I wish to call attention to that phase of the situation this afternoon. Losses having a public nature will be taken care of by governments, but what have we done for the private individual? Our present Vice President, Mr. GARNER, took the floor of this House during the Hoover administration and complained about what we had done for the banks, insurance companies, and railroads. "But what have you done for the private individual?" he asked. I have not forgotten. Well, we thought we had made some provisions to attain that objective.

A meeting of boards of selectmen was immediately called, and of the bankers, representatives of the Red Cross, and the agents of Disaster Loan Corporation. I want to pay the highest tribute possible for man to pay to the Red Cross and perhaps contrast its activities with those of the Government. The Red Cross representatives were at first amazed at the hesitancy of those needing assistance to ask therefor. Never before had they met such a condition. Truly the New England spirit of independence was well and truly exemplified.

The people of New England do not enjoy asking for assistance. But gradually they did come in; and in my congressional district, I am told, the Red Cross finally expended more funds for relief and rehabilitation than in any other particular section of New England. I followed up its work. I was amazed at the demonstrated efficiency of that great organization. The aim was to rehabilitate the unfortunate ones to the very condition they had been in prior to the disaster. If injured, they would succor them even for years to come. They assured us that there would be no lack of funds for such purposes. A wonderful work swiftly accomplished. Not a single case of dissatisfaction with the work or the decisions of the Red Cross has come to me.

Must we so much depend upon the Red Cross to take care of unfortunate individuals in such emergencies? The Disaster Loan Corporation was supposed to take up the matter of rehabilitation after the Red Cross had done its work. Just before I came to Washington I visited the office of the register of deeds and found that only one mortgage had been recorded from that county running to the Disaster Loan Corporation. I found the conditions recited in that mortgage of such interest that I shall at some time later place them in the RECORD. You will wish to read them.

I cannot blame the officials of the Corporation. They did their duty, but their authority to make loans was greatly restricted by the instructions and conditions imposed upon them.

I want to call attention to a case recommended to the Corporation by the local committee and his own banker. The loan was accepted, but the personal and unusual information demanded was much resented. He was unaccustomed to such searching and seemingly unnecessary examinations. He was not to be trusted to receive the lump sum, but was to be carefully watched as to every transaction involving the use of the loan. When the mortgage is given he must mortgage real estate, buildings, personal property, tools, and equipment "now owned or hereafter acquired." How could he honestly carry on his business under such conditions? This was the case of a highly honorable citizen, vouched for by the Disaster Loan Corporation's own committee and known to everyone in that vicinity as wholly reliable and trustworthy. Such supervision will not be tolerated by our people, and no great amount of money was loaned by the Corporation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman knows that the Disaster Loan Corporation was formed and organized after the great flood in the Ohio Valley of 1937. What the gentleman is stating now is exactly the experience we had. The Disaster Loan Corporation failed absolutely to do what the Congress intended it to do.

Mr. GIFFORD. Exactly. At that time we gave it \$20,000,000, as I recall it. It loaned some \$6,000,000 of that. I was on the committee which set up the Disaster Loan Corporation. I stated to the gentlemen representing that Corporation during the disaster that if they do not lose a lot of money it will be real proof that they have not done their job. We need have little worry that these corporations, controlled by the R. F. C., will lose much money. We have to issue orders from the Congress, as we did when one billion eight hundred million was actually given Mr. Hopkins by the R. F. C.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. At the time the bill creating the Disaster Loan Corporation was up for consideration the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Vinson, in response to a question, stated that the loans were to be made to people who could not give security and he doubted whether they ever would be paid back, and that the real purpose was to get the money into the hands of those who needed it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; we felt that instead of Hopkins giving it away we would lend it and try to get something back, as the prime purpose would be to furnish real relief without the bankers' viewpoint and the attorneys' lengthy and guarded conditions in the mortgage. I have no criticism of the agents of this Corporation. They desired to cooperate and it may yet be a little early to complain too much. I expect later on to receive information as to the number of applications made, the number granted and the sum involved in these loans to New England.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as usual, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is unduly exercised. For my part, I expect to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? He referred to me.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then I object.

Mr. RANKIN. I only have 5 minutes. The gentleman from Massachusetts had 15 minutes.

GOVERNOR AIKEN READS A DEFICIT AS A SURPLUS

Mr. Chairman, we are trying to do something for the people of New England, but we have the opposition of the Governor of Vermont, Governor Aiken. We have not got his "consent" yet.

From reading the morning papers, Mr. Chairman, one is led to place a new appraisal upon the value of the judgment of the distinguished chief executive of the State of Vermont, Governor Aiken. If you do not believe he is a "Daniel come to judgment," just listen to this news dispatch of yesterday from Montpelier, Vt. By the way, the headlines say that the legislature was "bewildered" at this revelation on the part of the Governor. The news dispatch reads as follows:

MONTPELIER, Vt., January 18, 1939.—The Vermont Legislature today received Gov. George D. Aiken's special message and amendment to the biennial budget, revealing a mistake of \$1,239,444, and transforming an estimated surplus of \$653,212 for the next 2 fiscal years into a deficit of more than \$586,000.

In other words, the Governor of Vermont seems to be unable to distinguish between a surplus and a deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has been asking, "Where are we going to get the money to meet the Government's obligations?" Now we know.

Governor Aiken, of Vermont, who cannot tell a deficit from a surplus, is a candidate for President on the Republican ticket. He has the unqualified support of the Power Trust

and other utilities from one end of this country to the other. If, when, and provided he is elected, and after he has been here sometime and they have milled around here in the House and the Senate for a few days, he can come in with a message and read the deficit as a surplus. That will show that the country is again prosperous. He can even read the national debt as an asset. The idea that a national debt is a national blessing originated in New England, at any rate.

Then they can proceed as they did back in the twenties, during the Harding-Coolidge regime, to reduce and pay back the income taxes of the big interests. That will start a boom on the New York Stock Exchange, and, indeed, we will then have real Republican prosperity, such as we had from 1923 to 1932. [Laughter.]

You know, when the Republicans came into power in 1921, they pretended to reduce the national debt. They did not tell you about all the money they gave back to the big income-tax payers, they did not tell you how they reduced the taxes of those interests, and they did not tell you about giving those same people rebates. The money they used to reduce the national debt was accumulated how? By simply canceling contracts the Democratic administration had made for war materials before the war closed, and also selling war materials and turning the money derived therefrom back into the Treasury and claiming credit for reducing the national debt to that extent.

They never did balance the Budget with revenues. What they did was to take the taxes off the people who got rich during the war, who made fortunes out of the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world. They had a real deficit from the time they came into power until they went out of power.

They have been searching all these years to find a candidate for President, one of those gentlemen who could perpetrate political, economic, or financial necromancy to such an extent that he could balance the Budget without taxing the people who have the money. Lo, they have found him. An ideal candidate for President on the Republican ticket. Governor Aiken of Vermont, who cannot tell a deficit from a surplus.

All he would have to do would be to come up here before a Republican House, if there were one, and a Republican Senate, if that should ever happen again, and instead of having a national debt of \$38,000,000,000 he could read that as a national asset. He could read the deficit as a surplus and show that prosperity had returned. Then demands would begin coming in for us to give that money back to the overburdened rich, as they did during the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime.

When Mr. Hoover was inaugurated the first thing they did was to raise the tariff, which was destroying American industry and American agriculture, and give back income taxes that were collected the year before and that at a time when bread lines were beginning to stretch down the streets of our cities.

So Governor Aiken, with his ability to change a deficit into a surplus with one stroke of his imagination, would make them an ideal candidate.

No, Mr. Chairman, this fight that is going on in New England is all camouflage. It is not being waged to help the people of New England but to try to embarrass the national administration; and it is only hurting the people of New England.

We propose to treat the people of New England just as we do the people of every other section of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use my time in expressing disapproval of the request for a \$3,500,000 appropriation for this new Census Building. I believe most of us were sent down here with the desire on the part of our constituents to reduce taxes, to cut out centralization of power here in Washington, and to cut out Government spend-

ing. Here is a wonderful opportunity and a practical place to begin that program, which is demanded by our constituents all over the United States.

I have before me the reports for May and November of the National Association of Building Owners and Managers showing the vacancies in office buildings in the larger cities throughout all the States of the Union. In these office buildings there is a total vacancy of 18 percent, or, expressed in square-foot area, there is a vacancy of 35,651,623 square feet.

The appropriation for this new building calls for the construction of a building having an area of 417,000 square feet for the use of the Census Bureau. Why not go out into the States and rent this space? I know the building owners and managers throughout the country would be willing and glad to give their vacant space at very reasonable rates in an effort to meet their running and operating expenses, their taxes, and the fixed charges on their properties, which have been standing vacant for the past 7 or 8 years.

I have before me a list of the 12 cities in which the Federal Reserve banks are located. I know you are all interested, because these cities are located throughout your districts. In Atlanta there is a vacancy of 368,870 square feet, or 14.56 percent of their total office-building area. In Boston there is a vacancy of 1,276,872 square feet, or 25.96 percent. I could go on with the other 10 cities and show similar percentages of vacancy, but my time will not permit. In my own city of Minneapolis there is a vacancy of 926,980 square feet, or 25.40 percent of the total square-foot area available in that city.

I also have here a list of the cities in which are located Federal land banks, cities such as Baltimore, St. Paul, Spokane, and Omaha. In these cities the percentage of vacancy runs about the same as that which I have indicated for the Federal Reserve bank cities.

I also have here a list of the cities in which there are Federal home-loan banks, and this list shows proportionately the same amount of vacancies as in the cities I have already mentioned.

It seems to me, if we really want to do something for our constituents who send us here to conserve the funds of our Government and to cut their taxes, this is a mighty fine and a very practical place to start. Let us divide up this Census business and send it back to the States, where it belongs. [Applause.] You are going to have to take the census out in the States anyway. Let us cut up into its component parts this census operation for which the request for space here in Washington is made and send it out into the cities I have mentioned, where the space is available. Why build more when we have over 35,000,000 square feet of building area vacant in this country today?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Most of the buildings constructed for governmental purposes cost from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000. This appropriation calls for the expenditure of only \$3,500,000. Does the gentleman understand this is to be just a temporary structure, erected to take care of the census of 1940?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not understand so, because the report of the committee states the building is to be constructed of brick and concrete, I believe, which it seems to me would constitute a permanent building.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that \$3,500,000 will be the total cost of this building?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am not familiar with that but understand good buildings here cost from ten to twenty millions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is rather a small amount. It will probably only be a start on the final expense involved.



Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the lists to which I referred previously in my remarks are as follows:

*Federal Reserve bank cities*

City	Vacancy	Percent of vacancy to total available area in each city
Atlanta.....	368,870 square feet.....	14.56
Boston.....	1,276,872 square feet.....	25.96
Chicago.....	5,520,020 square feet.....	20.48
Cleveland.....	1,425,666 square feet.....	20.40
Dallas.....	257,087 square feet.....	13.03
Kansas City.....	712,243 square feet.....	23.34
Minneapolis.....	926,980 square feet.....	25.40
New York City.....	10,632,651 square feet.....	17.70
Philadelphia.....	2,540,856 square feet.....	23.96
Richmond (4 build- ings only).....	9,435 square feet.....	3.18
St. Louis.....	946,309 square feet.....	31.93
San Francisco.....	823,241 square feet.....	12.44

*Federal land-bank cities*

City	Vacancy	Percent of vacancy to total available area in each city
Springfield, Mass.....	8,970 square feet.....	6.31
Baltimore.....	208,885 square feet.....	12.43
Columbia.....	Not listed.....	
Louisville.....	77,315 square feet.....	16.49
New Orleans.....	Not listed.....	
St. Louis.....	Listed above.....	
St. Paul.....	251,055 square feet.....	17.03
Wichita.....	16,730 square feet.....	6.56
Houston.....	171,186 square feet.....	8.34
Berkeley.....	Not listed.....	
Omaha.....	105,236 square feet.....	8.11
Spokane.....	134,476 square feet.....	18.80

*Federal home loan bank cities*

City	Vacancy	Percent of vacancy to total available area in each city
Boston.....	Shown in above report.....	
New York.....	do.....	
Pittsburgh.....	644,927.....	14.56
Winston-Salem.....	16,334.....	6.37
Cincinnati.....	Not listed.....	
Indianapolis.....	288,927.....	13.02
Chicago.....	Shown in above report.....	
Des Moines.....	37,759.....	6.15
Little Rock.....	7,839.....	13.72
Topeka.....	4,477.....	3.71
Portland.....	230,396.....	13.44
Los Angeles.....	1,539,962.....	17.63

Total buildings, 2,352 reporting all cities in United States.  
Total square feet area, 196,335,243.  
Total square feet vacancy, 35,651,623.  
Percent of vacancy to whole, approximately, 18.  
Figures as of Nov. 1, 1938. Last National Building Owners and Managers' Association report.

This vacancy has existed for the past several years. Shall we go on and build more buildings, creating greater public debt and more taxes, to say nothing of the excessive vacancy condition in present buildings in every city, or shall we call a halt by voting down this three and one-half million dollar appropriation for another building? [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, namely:

LEGISLATIVE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to the widow of Allard H. Gasque, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Robert L. Bacon, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of John J. Boylan, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Stephen W. Gambrill, late a Representative from the State of Maryland, \$10,000.

For payment to the widow of Ben Cravens, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas, \$10,000.

The five foregoing sums to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: For an additional amount for national forest protection and management, including the same purposes and objects specified under this head in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939, \$500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1940, and to be expended only for the protection and management of the White Mountain National Forest, N. H. and Maine, including the salvaging of wind-damaged timber and restoration of experimental areas therein.

New England hurricane damage: For rehabilitation and reestablishment of forest-protection improvements, reduction of forest-fire hazards, and prevention of forest fires on State, county, municipal, and private forest lands in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut that were damaged by the hurricane of September 1938, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, fiscal year 1939, to remain available until June 30, 1940, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply in the case of any expenditure hereunder where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300: *Provided further*, That the amount allocated for expenditure in any State of the amount herein appropriated shall be available when the State to which allocation has been made shall have made or shall make available a like sum from the State funds for the purposes contained herein.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.  
The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 3, line 13, strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert in place thereof "\$5,000,000".

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore to the bill the amount which was recommended to the Congress by the President, namely, \$5,000,000.

We have heard the various speeches made in connection with the devastating results of the hurricane and flood in New England. It is unnecessary for me to review in detail what has already been said. However, for whatever value any expressions of mine may be worth, I assure my colleagues that the damage to that section of New England visited by the hurricane was terrible. Fortunately, I come from a district that sustained no hurricane damage and, fortunately, I come from a district that has no flood-control problem, but I sympathize keenly with the people who live in the districts that were affected by the hurricane, and the people of other sections of the country who have been affected in the past, and who have the fear of being affected in the future by the visitation of floods. As a matter of fact, without any flood problem in my district, I introduced the 100 percent Federal Contribution Act, providing full contribution by the Federal Government. I always felt, even before the passage of the 1936 and 1938 Flood Control Acts, that the flood problems that confronted the various sections of our country, and the people of those sections, constituted not merely a State problem, but constituted a challenge to the Federal Government. I had to take a position for a time in opposition to the Governor of my own State in waging the fight that we did in the passage of the legislation last year.

In the next few days I expect to make some remarks on the flood-control situation as it now exists in New England because the position of the Federal Government is absolutely correct. On the occasion of the remarks I expect to make I shall state for the record the reasons I feel that way about it.

Coming now to the pending amendment, I have helped other sections of the country when they had their problems. I consider the problems, and particularly the emergency problems, of all other sections of the country as being my problems. I hope the day shall never come when I will develop a state of mind where I will look at the problems of other sections of the country from the limited, geographical

confines of New England. I try to look at things from a broad, national angle.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. McCORMACK. Briefly; yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. In the 22 years I have been a Member of this body, I believe this is the first time New England has ever come in and asked for Government help.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. In my 10 years as a member of this body, this is the first time in my recollection we have asked help.

Mr. KNUTSON. New England has helped the West with its grasshopper problem, and the South with its boll-weevil problem, and helped every other part of the country, and has never asked for anything, and I believe we should give them the \$5,000,000 without a dissenting voice.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is the gentleman seeking, by his amendment, to eliminate the matching provision?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; my amendment does not affect the matching provision and I do not intend to offer an amendment to change the proviso recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, although the committee should not have put it in. My amendment seeks only to increase the \$3,000,000, which is the amount recommended by the committee, to \$5,000,000, which is the amount recommended by the President.

The committee is an agent of the House. The committee has done its work, and anything I may say is not to be construed as a criticism of the committee; but you and I and other Members of the House constitute the principal. The House is the principal and, frequently, as in this case, we are justified, upon hearing the evidence, in saying to an agent of the House, which is the committee, "You have recommended well, but we feel that we should improve upon your recommendations." The recommendation of \$3,000,000 shows the need. The President has said \$5,000,000 is needed and that that is the minimum. The Department asked for over \$8,000,000.

My time is about up. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will vote for this amendment and thereby give to New England the minimum consideration it is entitled to. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. My district was one of those terribly affected and is one of the districts that was hurt most by the hurricane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 25 minutes. I shall ask for only 5 minutes of the 25 minutes, and in this connection I may say that practically all of the time yesterday afternoon was consumed in debating this item.

Although the time was supposed to be divided equally, the gentlemen on the other side had 2 hours and 16 minutes and this matter was thoroughly discussed during that time. We have been very liberal in the matter of debate and I hope the Members will permit the matter to be concluded in the time I suggested.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that the gentleman from Virginia make the time 30 minutes, with the understanding that outside of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Members will be recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request and ask unanimous consent that the time be limited

to 30 minutes and I should like to have the last 5 minutes of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, Mr. Chairman, to include therein certain statements from certain supplemental agencies regarding the flood and hurricane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will have to make that request in the House. The Committee has no power to grant it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. On January 3, the opening day of Congress, I introduced a bill which authorized an \$8,870,000 outright grant for the fire hazard. It contains other provisions that I shall not go into detail about, as they cannot be considered at this time. I shall support with great pleasure the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I received a telegram yesterday when I asked a ruling from the attorney general regarding the ability of Massachusetts, under its constitution, to match any Federal appropriation. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts requires, as does the provision in the bill before us, that the States match the Federal money. The attorney general, Paul E. Dever, replied as follows:

Nothing in State constitution prohibits Commonwealth appropriating money to match Federal contribution for removal of timber which is a fire hazard of sufficient magnitude to affect public safety.

With the added two and one-half millions by the Federal Government, we believe this amount is very small to take care of the needs in respect to the fire hazard. I quote now from a disinterested person regarding the extent of the hurricane. Mr. Charles F. Brooks, at the Blue Hills Meteorological Observatory, which appeared in the Geographical Review of January 1939:

The total economic loss is estimated at \$250,000,000. Although the loss of life has been greater in a few other hurricanes, the damage to property in this storm was the greatest that ever occurred in a single storm anywhere in all the world.

Further text of Mr. Brooks' statement follows:

HURRICANES INTO NEW ENGLAND—METEOROLOGY OF THE STORM OF SEPTEMBER 21, 1938

(Charles F. Brooks, Blue Hills Meteorological Observatory)

The hurricane of September last was a whirling, circular storm with very destructive winds spread over a diameter of 200 miles. At its center was the usual calm eye, some 40 miles in breadth. This vortex rushed northward to Long Island and New England with the speed of an express train, augmenting wind velocities to extremes of about 120 miles an hour on the east of the path of the center. The wind drove the sea water with such force that, when added to the rise in sea level due to the low pressure and thrown against the coast, the sea rose 10 to 15 feet above the expected level, in itself high water, the time being high tide. Towering surges on this combined astronomical tide and storm wave threw the sea to such heights that demolition was general along the exposed coast and hundreds of persons were engulfed and drowned. Flying spray incrustated windows and salt killed vegetation 20 miles inland, and traces were found even 50 miles from the raging sea. Inland, the rivers, already flooded by 4 days of tropical rains, added to the destruction.

The gale, roaring in great gusts over the countryside, broke off or uprooted millions of trees, damaged or destroyed thousands of buildings, and, directly or indirectly, downed nearly 20,000 miles of electric-power and telephone lines. Many people were killed or injured by falling trees, chimneys, or flying debris. The damage was most extensive on the tops and sides of hills. There were also lanes of destruction where particularly vicious gusts, attended perhaps by eddies, had plowed through the woods, breaking off trees or uprooting them from the sodden ground. More than 5,000,000 board-feet of timber were thrown down, leaf pulp turned white houses green, and leaves that were not blown to pieces were "scorched" by the beating, desiccating gale.

There were some 600 lives lost. The American Red Cross places the deaths at 488, with 100 additional missing, and 1,754 more or less injured. The Works Progress Administration survey places the loss of human life at 682. The Red Cross also finds that 93,122 families suffered more or less serious property losses; that 6,933



summer dwellings, 1,991 other dwellings, and 2,605 boats were destroyed; also 2,369 barns and 7,438 other buildings. The total economic loss is estimated at \$250,000,000 to \$330,000,000. Although the loss of life has been greater in a few other hurricanes, the damage to property in this storm was the greatest that ever occurred in a single storm anywhere in the world.

Such things had happened before—in 1815 and 1635—and had been vividly recorded in newspapers, meteorological records, and town chronicles, and in Sidney Perley's *Historic Storms of New England*. In fact, Perley describes 10 storms of hurricane intensity in 2½ centuries and Tannehill lists 8 more, and there have been 4 more in the last 50 years, which makes 5 or 10 New England hurricanes to a century and 1 that is especially fierce and widespread in each century and a half.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. J. H. Rich, assistant professor of forestry of the Massachusetts State College:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE,  
Amherst, January 6, 1939.

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In my opinion timber salvage in Massachusetts will be a dismal failure unless your bill to guarantee 100-percent payment for delivered logs is passed. This will conform to my original plan, which has become so warped and twisted that it is hardly recognizable.

However, to change the general principle of the plan of purchasing logs at concentration areas would destroy all hopes of salvage and the resultant protection of local forest industries and their dependent communities. Machinery is already in motion. Your bill, if passed, will give it the proper impetus, and literally thousands of independent operators will soon be at work.

Timber salvage is the best kind of fire-hazard reduction. As soon as logs are removed, the woods become accessible in case of fire and can be protected. In this way timber salvage becomes self-liquidating fire-hazard reduction.

I do not believe the 100-percent payment excessive because the logs are purchased on a strict grade basis, culls on which the operators have always lost money are left in the woods, and the concentration of raw material in large units permits lower cost and higher-quality manufacture. Massachusetts has for many years imported about 85 percent of its lumber consumption. Higher-quality manufacture which is bound to follow should recapture some of our markets.

I believe that the logs now in storage will sell for 100 percent of their cost plus a reasonable overhead. Even were such a price not quite obtainable, the additional expense is justified by the resultant fire-hazard reduction.

Your efforts in this problem will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. H. RICH,  
Assistant Professor of Forestry.

P. S.—Unless logs are salvaged, forest fires are very likely to destroy the water-holding capacity of our hillsides and add considerably to the problem of flood control.

The following expert advice has been sent to me; and as it presents a phase of the picture, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

1. When the Forest Service was precipitated into the hurricane-disaster work in New England by order of the President, the State conservation agencies were called into consultation in Boston and a definite plan of hazard elimination developed and agreed upon. State projects involving the use of available W. P. A. facilities were submitted and acted upon immediately. These resulted in 15,000 to 17,000 men being employed on hazard-elimination work, a totally inadequate number, but the maximum that could be utilized in areas accessible to the sources of supply of labor. All of the C. C. C. camps administered by the Forest Service, State agencies, and the Park Service were turned over to the coordinating agency and their efforts directed toward hazard elimination.

2. Realizing the necessity for proper supervision and direction, the Forest Service drew upon its resources of experienced personnel, established an office in Boston to assume direct responsibility for the operations, and employed field technicians through the W. P. A. to exercise technical direction over the hazard-elimination operations and to inventory the extent of the damage, the hazard, and the requirements to meet the catastrophe.

3. As a result of the action taken, an integrated program of hazard elimination has been developed in cooperation with the State agencies, and something over 20,000 men have expended their efforts in an attempt to reduce the hazard to normal. This program has required planning, organization work on a tremendous scale, and constant supervision. It could have been accomplished in no other way than through the detail of experienced Forest Service personnel to the job. It can be carried on in no other way. The State agencies were totally unprepared to cope with a disaster of such proportions.

4. The hurricane damage in New England was not confined to ruined forests. There was a tremendous loss of property of all kinds

and the States were overwhelmed in their attempt to repair the effects of wind and flood. Towns utilized all possible labor in clearing away debris, in repairing sewer and water systems. The burden of men and money fell heavily on towns and States.

5. The fire-hazard-reduction work being directed by the Forest Service covers some 600 towns in the stricken area. In nearly all of these towns committees have been organized and have been occupied with aiding in the fire-hazard reduction, giving of their time and money freely.

6. In Mr. Tinker's memorandum to you dated December 22, he wrote as follows:

"The fire-hazard-reduction work has proceeded under severe limitations. Unfortunately, W. P. A. has not been able to furnish us anything like the required number of men. The estimated force required was 39,000, whereas at the peak in late November only 18,000 men were obtained. Fire-hazard conditions in New England, as they will exist next spring, cannot be exaggerated. To anyone who has been in the disaster area, the thought of the possibilities of a disaster even greater than the hurricane is appalling. The timber salvage work this winter will appreciably reduce the fire hazard but in spite of this, under the limitations that now exist in elimination work, the situation next spring will represent a very real menace to the public safety."

"If the above-enumerated measures are not taken and fires are not adequately handled during the coming spring fire season, I predict there will be loss of life and property throughout the path of this hurricane equal and even beyond that done by the storm itself. I feel a tremendous responsibility in all these undertakings and feel that all influential and thinking people should be properly apprised of the exact situation and then prepare to prevent these things from happening."

7. The Forest Service estimates that there is a gross area affected by the hurricane of about 14,000,000 acres in the New England States needing protection, with about 150,000 acres of blown-down timber where intensive fire hazard reduction work over a period of almost 2 years will be needed to reduce the hazard to normal. There are about 1,200 miles of roads to be opened and about 950 miles of telephone lines and five lookout towers to be constructed. To make possible quick action for fire suppression it will be necessary to organize, in conjunction with the States, fire-suppression and fire-fighting crews to be ready to act expeditiously. The necessary fire-fighting equipment must be purchased and located at strategic points throughout the area and the organized crews instructed in the use of this equipment. All of this organization is for protective purposes while the work of removing the blown-down timber is being carried on. Our minimum plan calls for about 7,500 temporary employees to carry on fire-hazard reduction. This force includes patrolmen, foremen, straw bosses, and about 5,800 laborers. This force is in addition to the C. C. C. camps and whatever W. P. A. labor can be secured for use in areas accessible to such labor.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful, as I know the other Members from New England are, to the Appropriations Committee for their fine hearings, and I feel very sure that if at that time they realized fully the extent of the fire hazard that we would have been given the \$5,000,000. I feel sure that at the time they did not realize that our forests are not like the forests in other sections of the country, forests over which I have flown in past years. There, there are huge forest areas, and they can be protected more easily, because there is but one section to protect. The forests there are centralized. They already are equipped with fire towers, telegraph wires, fire lanes, and so forth. With us, our forests are scattered. In New England most of the farms were built by cutting down the timber and then the homes and other buildings were built and orchards planted. If there should be a fire in any one locality, very likely many people would be burned badly, in fact, burned to death; and when I tell you there are 531 families per square mile in the Massachusetts area you will realize the danger to life if such a catastrophe should occur.

I wonder how many of you have been in a house which caught fire when there was an invalid in the house and where there was no one strong enough to move that invalid. I had that experience. Mercifully, firemen arrived just in time to save her. Next to my own district there is a sanitarium in the midst of timberland. That timber is down. There are hospitals and sanatoria in my own district surrounded by timber. That timber also is down. Everyone knows that down timber and brush constitute a perfectly laid fire. A spark only would set fire to the New England tinder box and there is a tremendous fire hazard.

I must express here my appreciation to the Disaster Loan Corporation and to Senator Charles Henderson, of the R. F. C., who came to New England to open Disaster Loan

offices. While that Corporation did not do all that I asked, it has been enormously helpful, and my own city has the largest Disaster Loan office in the State. It will interest my fellow colleagues from the South that the first man in charge of that office was Mr. Smith Blair, a fine gentleman from Virginia. He went with me and a secretary over a great deal of my devastated area. He worked on Sundays and at night, as did and as do representatives of the Farm Credit Administration and Debt Adjustment Administration. The Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration has done exceptionally fine work. Mr. Silcox and his aides toiled tirelessly. In my own house during the hurricane I lost a chimney and the slates came off the roof like cards off a deck blown by the wind, and the windows blew in. The house shook as in an earthquake. I know what it was, both in the house and outside, as I motored over the roads, with trees coming down right and left.

As I said before, one of the things that makes it so difficult for us is that the hurricane jumped from place to place. The damage is not in a centralized, localized spot. There have been floods and hurricanes in other sections of the United States, but never in our history has there been such a dangerous, far-reaching fire hazard. There is also a precedent for an outright grant; in fact, there are a number of them. You probably all know that millions of dollars have been given to the Dust Bowl for the rehabilitation of private property and the protection of it. Why not give New England the same protection? It faces a fire hazard almost beyond belief. To give you a little of the extent of the timber damage, let me read the statement from the Forestry Division of the United States Government, as follows:

I am pleased to give you the following figures, which are the closest estimates available:

Total volume of blown-down timber-----feet----	2,650,000,000
Total volume of salvageable timber-----do-----	1,640,000,000
Value of total blown-down timber (on the ground)---	\$13,250,000
Value of salvageable material (on the ground)-----	\$8,000,000
Value of salvageable material cut into logs and	
hailed to mill or concentration point-----	\$19,680,000
Value of salvageable material sawed into lumber----	\$36,000,000

Eighty percent of the above is softwoods, chiefly white pine.  
Twenty percent is hardwood (oak, birch, maple, etc.).

Number of people in peril in case of fire: Average in the sparsely settled country areas, 75 people to the square mile; all New England but Maine, 213 per square mile; Massachusetts, density of 533 per square mile.

There are two precedents to make direct grants on fire-hazard reduction work—the Civilian Conservation Corps Act and the W. P. A. Act—each of which have provided for preventive work.

As there are 25,000 or 30,000 timber owners in Massachusetts alone, and 70 percent are small owners, having farms of 70 to 100 acres, the greatest burden will fall upon those least able to bear that burden.

Of the \$19,000,000 appropriated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for hurricane work, the following two allocations were made to the Massachusetts Division of Forestry: \$750,000 allocated for fire-hazard reduction, and so forth, to be used on State forests only; \$123,000 allocated for repair work due to the emergency.

Besides these two allocations to the Massachusetts Division of Forestry, there was the regular appropriation of \$152,856, used for administration costs, and so forth.

The remainder of the \$19,000,000 was distributed through the other State departments. Remember, our roads, our bridges were damaged. Sanitation was in bad condition.

Again to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] I repeat that the State in appropriating \$19,000,000 for flood and hurricane damage gave over \$1,000,000 protection in the State forests. The gentleman from Virginia said yesterday on the floor that that was an infinitesimally small part of the \$19,000,000. I trust that he will feel that \$5,000,000 is an infinitesimally small part for our needs and will grant our request in that respect. If we do not have these five or six million dollars, we will have, according to the experts in the forestry association, and the experts in other governmental

departments, tremendous damage by fire and tremendous loss of life, and I say to the representatives of the other sections of the country that a great loss of purchasing power will hurt their sections tremendously. This is not a matter local to New England. It is a great national calamity.

I earnestly hope, my colleagues from the other sections of the country, that you will aid New England in our hour of need. I must pay tribute to the courage of my own people in my own district and in my own State during that flood and hurricane. I was out on the dikes at night, the dikes which were partially built by the Army engineers, which served to protect the houses from the tremendous rush of water, but which did not prevent the flood, as they were not completed, and the pumps were not installed; and, remember, in the last 2 years my people in the Merrimack Valley have suffered two floods and two freshets besides the devastating hurricane of September.

These people were forced to move from their homes. Not a complaint did I hear. I went about through towns that had no light and no telephonic communications, towns that had no heat, towns that had no radio communication, in order to try to take to the different inhabitants the information as to what might be done by Government agencies. Never one word of complaint did I hear from those people.

I went to one little farmhouse on the top of a hill, and I found that the night before, during the hurricane, a farmer, the husband of a woman there, and her father had cut timber and dragged it aside for 3 miles in order to go for a doctor.

Women in other localities in my district for days cooked their meals over open fires as they did in the early days of New England. There was illness as a result of exposure and overwork in the rain and wind. Orchard growers have lost beautiful orchards which grew the finest apples. Those men will have no income for 10 years, because it requires 10 years for an apple tree to grow before bearing fruit. Farmers lost their cows, due to exposure, for days even after the hurricane. They lost their poultry, but uncomplainingly. Those people are desperate; they are desperate over removing the fire hazard; over moving the logs that must be put into ponds as cut, if they are to be put into sawmills, if they are to be salvaged. They do not have the means. They do not have the facilities to do this. All the time many of these people are faced with meeting payments on mortgages without that with which to meet their bills.

I earnestly hope that the Members will join in supporting this amendment.

I have photographs here which will show that the houses are in the timberland itself and that there is danger of loss of life and injury to all those residing in that area. The huge recreational center in New England will be affected. Hotels will be burned. Hospitals will be razed to the ground and many of the inmates will doubtless be burned. Our need is very great. I ask your support. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of debate on this particular feature of this deficiency appropriation bill. However, I do not want to allow the debate to close without informing the House of the very efficient manner in which the Federal Government, at the time of this disaster, placed all of its agencies at the disposal of the afflicted area. I believe my colleagues from New England, both Republican and Democrat, will agree that immediate response was given by the Federal Government. The Administrator of W. P. A. flew across the country from California to Massachusetts and held a meeting in Boston within a few days after the disaster at which were present the Governors of the various States affected, mayors, selectmen, and town officials. Every means that the Government could place at the disposal of those duly elected officials was marshalled almost overnight. We did receive a great deal of assistance in our cities and towns where huge trees were blown down, tearing gaping holes in the sidewalks and streets. Our utilities were paralyzed and streets and highways were rendered impassable. In record time all the agencies of the Federal



Government were thrown into action and our State, city, and town officials all cooperated to a remarkable extent with the result that within a very short time the vital services were restored to the people, channels of transportation were cleared, and funds were made available to restore damaged property, both public and private. This restoration has in the main been completed in the populous centers. No account of this catastrophe would be complete without a tribute to the valuable and heroic work of the men on W. P. A. and the boys of the C. C. C. during this emergency.

But there remains this fire hazard, caused by the piling up of inflammable brush on the thousands of acres of wooded area of the New England States on both private property and public domain. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] yesterday exhibited some photographs, which I think were most imposing evidence of the situation which is typical in every corner of New England.

As the gentleman stated, unless this inflammable debris is removed at once from public and private property, there is a grave danger of a very serious fire hazard menacing the welfare of thousands of people throughout the New England States. It will endanger hospitals and public buildings, towns, and cities in an area which, as you all know, is very heavily populated. Because of these compelling reasons we ask you to restore the amount of this appropriation to \$5,000,000, the amount recommended by the Budget. Mr. Silcox, of the Forestry Division, and his assistants who have been on the scene say that this amount is absolutely necessary to complete the work of clearing up this very serious fire hazard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I represent a State that has suffered the greatest down-timber loss of any of the New England States. I believe that of all the New England States the greatest fire hazard exists in New Hampshire, both on private lands and in our National and State forests. For that reason I am especially interested and hopeful that this amendment will pass. I believe the full amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, namely, \$5,000,000, should be the amount approved.

It was stated yesterday on the floor of this House that the adoption of this amendment would establish a precedent. The precedent of Federal aid to a stricken area already has been established. It was established in 1906 when the Congress of the United States passed three acts, carrying a total appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the relief of the people of San Francisco, Calif., who were the victims of the devastating earthquake and fire of that year.

It is difficult for the Members of this House to realize the seriousness of the situation that exists as the result of the damage done by the hurricane that swept over New England on September 21, last, the fourth worst disaster that has ever befallen the people of this country. The loss to our people in New England is tremendous, regardless of what amount of money this Government loans or allocates as an outright gift. This bill does not call for money to compensate for the loss of private individuals, but rather to prevent further loss by fire this coming summer.

I have talked with a representative of the Forestry Department, who has just returned from making a survey of this fire hazard, and he has advised me that the damage and the danger of further destruction is beyond comprehension.

The Forestry Bureau has asked for the transfer of 31 camps from the South up into New England, but as yet nothing has been done to comply with this recommendation. In the immediate future I will introduce a bill to move 40 additional camps into New England to eliminate this hazard, but even this will be only a small part of what is required.

I realize that the Committee on Appropriations is anxious to reduce the expenditures of the Government; so am I, but not at the risk of having further appalling damage done by fire this coming summer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] for 3 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], which provides for an increase in this appropriation from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

There has been much said here yesterday and today as to the necessity for this appropriation. I think that in some respects the direct issue that is before us has been somewhat misunderstood. This appropriation has been recommended and is supported by the entire New England delegation, because the funds are absolutely necessary if the fire hazard which has been occasioned by the New England hurricane is to be materially reduced. Even the increased amount of money will not adequately do the job. I wish to place the most emphasis possible upon the fact that it is the terrible menace of a potential forest conflagration such as this country has never experienced which we are trying to picture to you here today, and in that connection I wish to use the words of that very fine and estimable Chief of the Forest Service of this Government, Mr. Silcox. On page 43 of the hearings on this bill, he said:

The extent of the damage is hardly comprehensible. It is unbelievable unless you see the area personally.

And then, again, on page 47 of the reported hearings, Mr. Silcox said:

But I am stating to this committee that the situation up there is one that invites public disaster. Fires may easily start, and this is a heavily populated country. It will affect towns and hospitals and camping grounds, etc. And if a fire gets in there under a high wind, it will be as bad as was the hurricane itself and as bad as some of our western fires, as in Minnesota, for instance.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Silcox has made extensive trips over this afflicted area and that is his experienced estimate of the situation. Mr. Tinker, his assistant, who is directly in charge in the New England area in connection with this fire menace told this committee, as is quoted on page 49 of the hearings:

Mr. Cannon raised a very good question in connection with that tuberculosis sanitarium situation. They have around 300 or 400 acres. They can clean it up. And that will be all right. But that is within an area of inflammable material of about 10 miles wide and 20 miles long. I suppose there are four or five hundred owners in there. But a fire there might jump 2 miles. Those people are just in a terrible predicament. I would not want any of my family living in that area.

These brief notations, Mr. Chairman, from men who have been actually on the ground floor and who know what the condition is should be enough to convince the members of this committee that this increased appropriation is necessary to remove the possibility of the ravaging results of a disastrous forest conflagration.

There is another point in support of this increased appropriation that has not been touched upon to any great extent, however. That is the matter of protection for the Federal Government's equity in the White Mountain National Forest Park. Without doubt many of the members of this committee and of this House have visited this beautiful recreational area—this area which is heavily wooded and forested—this area which is in the midst of this particularly devastated section of the country. In the White Mountain National Forest Park taxpayers of this Nation have invested tremendous sums of money, and these millions of dollars we are protecting insofar as is possible at this time with an appropriation of \$500,000 for the reduction of the fire hazard within the White Mountain area itself. But we insist that in order to protect adequately this tremendous investment of the citizens of this country in this park we must remove the menace of spreading forest fires which may be occasioned by the fallen timber and the slash which now exists as a result of this windstorm in the adjoining sections outside of the park area itself. Certainly the tremendous Federal investment in the White Mountains deserves your serious consideration and your favorable action here this afternoon in providing sufficient funds to clear the surrounding thousands of acres which now constitute a potential fire threat of the greatest magnitude to this Government property.

I hope that by your action in supporting this amendment for an increase of this appropriation to \$5,000,000 you will

demonstrate your willingness not only to remove the fire hazard from the areas affected in and of themselves, but that you will also in doing so protect the tremendous Federal Government investment in the White Mountain National Park. It seems to me that such action is good business and for the best interests of all concerned, namely, the entire citizenry of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that I was given ample opportunity to discuss this subject yesterday, and I would not ask for even this brief period except to call the attention of the House to two features. First, I referred yesterday in my remarks to the possibility of a constitutional prohibition against matching dollar for dollar. I have been reliably informed by the officials of Massachusetts that this now is not a danger in the minds of the officials of the State. So far as I am concerned, therefore—and I think I am speaking for my colleagues, both from Massachusetts and other States—we approve the report of the Committee on Appropriations calling for matching dollar for dollar.

The other point that I wish to raise is that whatever sum Congress sees fit to appropriate for this work will largely—practically all of it—go into labor. It is not as though you were paying a dollar to anybody for profit. The amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] involves nothing having to do with any payment of money to any individual. The money will be used for labor in that area. Certainly no better assurance can be given by the Federal Government to show its appreciation of the opportunity to use ample labor during these winter months than to help clean up this terrible fire hazard that is certainly hanging over all of New England.

As has been said, we have been generous to other sections of the country. We are now asking only that New England, and all the States of New England, have just a little, fair share of the Federal money that is distributed.

I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I hope it will be adopted by the House unanimously.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely for this amendment, because just before I came down here I went through the wooded sections in the vicinity of my own city. I could not walk more than 50 feet without having to climb over huge trees that once grew on West Rock, East and Pin Rocks. I know that many in this Chamber have been in New Haven, the city where Yale University is located, and that they can realize that the rocks and hills around that city must be strewn with trees.

As one who went through this hurricane at the shore and saw the devastation that hit us for the first time in a hundred years, it is impossible for me to picture to you the destruction and fire hazard there was and is in my own home city of New Haven, an industrial center of 170,000. The forests are literally strewn with trees. Unless these are taken out, unless this fire hazard is removed, it will cost us more than we can ever possibly hope to pay.

I may say in passing that I think our Governors will accept this without question. I certainly think this help is absolutely needed.

May I also say that when other cities, other States, and other districts were celebrating their tercentenaries, or even their sesquicentennials, they asked the Federal Government for contributions. The State of Connecticut celebrated her tercentenary in 1930. We asked for and received \$10,000, but, as a matter of fact, not a cent of it was used; we used none of the money given by this Congress. We ran our own show. Now we need help. For one of the first times in the history of our State and of the other States of New England we are in the position where we must have assistance. This small sum that we ask be given to us in New England is

vitaly needed, and we who come from New England would not ask for it unless it were absolutely necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a rather unusual thing to see the committee that has been as generous as the Committee on Appropriations has been in this particular case with our brethren from New England, now being somewhat criticized by some of our friends and taken to task. Let us hesitate before we vote and before we go on record on this, because that is where we shall probably have to go—let us see just what we are doing, what we are spending.

There was a great disaster in the Mississippi Valley. The Mississippi Valley flood sufferers had W. P. A. labor, they had the Red Cross, and they had disaster loans. The sufferers of the tragedy from the New England hurricane have had all of that assistance plus C. C. C. assistance.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is passed, it will be the first time the Congress has set the precedent of taking Federal money and expending it upon private land. This precedent the Committee on Appropriations was willing to violate. Not only that, but we have brought it in here when you gentlemen knew it was subject to a point of order. Personally, I do not feel very good about the matter. I feel the committee has been generous to a point of deserving criticism for its generosity.

Mr. Chairman, what does this amendment do, if agreed to by the committee and then adopted on a record vote in the House? What does it do? Instead of having \$5,000,000 to clear up these private lands you will have \$10,000,000 to do it, because this amendment calls for a matching of the funds. The Bureau of the Budget estimated it would take \$5,000,000 to do this and at a time when there was no evidence of the States doing anything except through the \$1,000,000 which the State of Massachusetts has provided. The Bureau of the Budget estimated \$5,000,000. The committee recommends \$3,000,000, to be matched by State funds, making \$6,000,000, or \$1,000,000 more than requested by the Budget. This amendment would give you \$10,000,000 to do the job and sets a precedent that never has been set in this country. No disaster in this country has had anything for property damage or destruction except a loan from the Government, yet we are sending the Forest Service on to private lands to clean them up because there is a fire hazard.

I hope the Committee will support us. We have been generous, just, and fair to this great section of our country. There have been no politics in this matter except what some of these gentlemen who have spoken tried to lug in by inference. In the committee there were no politics. I hope the Committee will back the Appropriations Committee in this matter and vote down the amendment, and permit the amount to stand which we have provided.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCORMACK) there were—ayes 68, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: For carrying out the purposes and provisions of, and for expenditures authorized under, Public Resolution No. 91, Seventy-fifth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs,' approved April 6, 1937," approved May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 344, 1126), fiscal year 1939, to remain available until December 31, 1939, \$2,000,000.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.



The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, line 24, after the colon, strike out the word "for" and insert "for the eradication of white fringed beetles for."

Page 4, line 8, strike "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,300,000."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add to the pests which are to be eradicated the white fringed beetle, and would provide the sum of \$300,000 and add that to the sum of the appropriation for this eradication.

We are told by the experts in the Bureau of Entomology of the Department of Agriculture that the white fringed beetle is more dangerous to all plant life which it attacks than all the other six well-known pests. It is more dangerous, therefore, than the boll weevil and the pink bollworm are to cotton and, in fact, more dangerous than all the other six pests put together.

I am not informed accurately as to whether or not any part of this appropriation may be or is intended to be used for the eradication of these pests; therefore, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether or not he has any information which he could give us at this time on the subject?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman, my information is that the fund can be used for the eradication of the white fringed beetle. I have no objection to the gentleman putting that in if he wishes to do so; but, of course, I shall object to increasing the amount because it is not necessary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield? If the activities of this eradication work are to be materially extended, the committee has already cut the Budget estimate by \$1,300,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not to be extended. It was testified in the hearings that the funds to be appropriated would be used for the eradication of the white-fringed beetle, as well as other pests. That is part of the program, and the insertion of this language would not extend the program. They are going to use it for that purpose so far as our records show, anyway.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much money have they unexpended? Has the gentleman any information on that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They have \$700,000 unexpended this year. We are giving them \$2,000,000 more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. On page 39 of the report it appears that \$299,514 have been considered in the eradication of the beetle to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the bill covers the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. I hope it does.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the chairman's assurance, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that part of my amendment which seeks to increase the amount of the appropriation by \$300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Page 4, line 8, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,300,000."

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this matter is so important to us in the West and in the northwestern territory that I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the history of the amendment I am offering goes back first to a recommendation of the Bureau of Entomology for an appropriation in

the sum of \$6,170,000. After quite a thorough investigation the Bureau of the Budget recommended the sum of \$3,300,000. There is a balance of \$700,000 in the fund now within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Entomology to expend for this purpose, and this will make a total of \$4,000,000 to be expended for the purpose, if my amendment is agreed to.

I wish to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there is an acreage all told of 51,000,000 acres that will have to be treated. A large percentage of these 51,000,000 acres is Government owned. In doing this work we shall be assisting not only our farmers but the United States Government.

A few of my colleagues in the House wanted me to ask in this amendment for the full amount recommended by the Bureau of Entomology, which knows more about the needs of the situation than any Member of Congress. I have read the evidence offered before the subcommittee, and it is without dispute that it would require in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000 to do this job well and successfully. I call your attention to the explicit language of Dr. Strong, here in Washington, who is at the head of this Bureau:

I am telling you what it will take to actually do the job and do it right. I do not know how we would start with \$3,300,000 to do the job the way it ought to be done.

Mr. Chairman, the man who said that is a man who knows the situation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the conference I had with the gentleman from Montana I was perfectly willing to agree that the gentleman's amendment should call for only \$3,300,000. The gentleman has stated that Representatives coming from other States which are affected by this grasshopper plague felt the gentleman should ask for \$6,000,000 in his amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. To support the \$6,000,000 estimate, and particularly to support the gentleman's amendment, as I have now agreed to do, I wish to read a telegram I have received from Mr. Howard Wahlgren, president of the Nebraska Crop Growers' Association. It reads as follows:

Believe Bureau of Budget's \$3,300,000 recommendation for insect control wholly inadequate. Think six million minimum imperative. Midwest chinchbug invasion also indicated this year.

HOWARD WAHLGREN,

President, Nebraska Crop Growers' Association.

In other words, the \$3,300,000 the gentleman is asking is the minimum that can possibly be used to do the job.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly; I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have only a short time. I will yield to the gentleman in a few minutes.

There are 24 States that are usually infested by grasshoppers. Eleven of these States are infested not only by the grasshoppers but by Mormon crickets. I saw something that was supposed to be a Mormon cricket exhibited out here. If that is a Mormon cricket, the fellow who got that sample got it right out of the egg. It did not have a chance to grow.

Think of the vast territory with which we have to deal. If you will read the report of the hearings, you will find it points out that over \$6,000,000 of damage was done in three or four counties in eastern Montana when the grasshoppers from the Dakotas lifted themselves into the heavens and alighted in our fields in Montana. It is also shown in this record that every dollar expended means a saving of \$79 to the stock growers, the wheat growers, and the grain growers of these 24 States. Are we going to economize by depriving these people of the very thing that might help to enable them to fight one of the greatest menaces we have in the West?

If we can raise a crop in the West, our relief roll will be decreased. If we do not raise a crop, we will have to come

here and ask help from this committee, headed by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], one of the finest men in the House and one of the ablest and most influential, and he will help us. We can further call on the Republican side of the House, which includes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], although they are the watchdogs of the United States Treasury on that side, and we can also appeal for help to our friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and also to the minority leader, our good friend, JOE MARTIN, and many other good and worthy Republicans. Those gentlemen over there will help out. However, we do not want to be coming here every year on our knees, asking Congress for help. We want a chance to fight the thing we have nothing to do with creating. God Almighty created these things for some purpose, although I do not know what.

Now, help us by helping yourselves, and, in the language of my distinguished new friend, the affable gentleman from the State of Florida, PAT CANNON, vote against the grasshoppers and against these crickets by voting for my amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HILL. Is not time an essential element in this problem?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; it is very important.

Mr. HILL. If we get the money now it will do more good than if we spent \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 later in the year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Bureau of Entomology asked for \$6,000,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Six million one hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. KNUTSON. The committee has reduced this sum to \$2,000,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Right.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman now offers an amendment to increase the sum by \$1,300,000?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Correct; the amount the Budget recommended.

Mr. KNUTSON. And this with the \$700,000 now available still leaves the amount 33 1/3 percent less than the sum the Bureau of Entomology stated is necessary?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. You cannot eradicate grasshoppers piecemeal. All the money that has been spent by the Government in this work in years gone by will be absolutely wasted unless we continue the work to a point where we have the grasshoppers whipped.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right; and not only that, but this is a national problem.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When we are affected out there, you are likewise affected in the East.

Mr. KNUTSON. And it involves the food supply of the American people.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKELSON. I want to ask the gentleman from Montana if this is not a yearly occurrence.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Almost; yes.

Mr. THORKELSON. And it will require actually about \$6,000,000 to take care of it properly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. THORKELSON. And it is a matter that is affecting the Nation's food supply.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. THORKELSON. And it is a pest that should be destroyed now.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that this grasshopper infestation started in the drought-stricken area and began in a few States, but is now gradually covering one-half of the States of the Union?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. And unless we can check this invasion of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets and similar pests, every State in the Union will become involved.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In fact, 2 years ago, just to show the devastation that was wrought in Nebraska alone, there was \$11,500,000 worth of crops destroyed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is right. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, and I would like to have the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of the most important, in my opinion, that has been offered on the floor of this House. We can all appreciate the destruction caused by fire; we can all appreciate the destruction caused by water, because those two forces are very spectacular, but the destruction caused by grasshoppers, if you please, in my State, has been greater than that caused by either of the two forces I have just mentioned.

For several years there has been waged in my State of New Mexico, as well as in many other agricultural and livestock States, an incessant and unrelenting battle against the grasshopper and other destructive pests. Our State and hundreds of individual citizens have cooperated with the Federal Government in this warfare against needless destruction, with the result that much progress has been made and thousands of farmers and stockmen have been given new courage and confidence in the hope that the battle will continue until the grasshopper scourge has become a thing of the past; that their crops and livestock feed will not be destroyed and their meager earnings and assets will not be wiped out in future years.

I doubt if anyone who has not seen an invasion of countless millions of grasshoppers under way can realize the extent of the destruction that is wrought. In my State of New Mexico last year and for several years previous these pests have laid waste to lands over an area of more than 5,000 square miles, have destroyed every vestige of living green growth, stripped crops and grass as cleanly from the earth as though a fire had swept through. As a result thousands of our farmers have been forced on the relief rolls; men and women who have battled against drought and all other forms of adversity but have not given up the fight until the grasshopper army destroyed virtually all they possessed.

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine has given valuable assistance in the past; it is desirous of continuing its campaign against these destructive pests; and I believe we should appropriate the modest amount necessary. The citizens are willing again to give their services voluntarily, but there must be sufficient funds provided for the proper Federal agency to do its share, because this is not purely a State proposition. The menace spread from State to State and throughout the Nation. The march of these destructive pests extends over hundreds of miles and as they travel they deposit their eggs in the earth, which, if they are not destroyed, mean that the scourge will be repeated year after year.

In my opinion, it is far better economy to increase this appropriation by a million dollars, and thus prevent the recurrence of this destruction, than to pare down and stint the



appropriation and then spend hundreds of millions caring for the farmers whose crops have been destroyed, and to swell further the already too-large relief rolls of the Nation.

Is it not consistent with the policy of this Congress in its program for rehabilitation of the farmer to provide sufficient funds to insure him against destruction of his crops? The farmer, the very backbone of our national economic structure, should not be forced to work long hours for months, then be confronted overnight with the destruction of all that he has accomplished. Most certainly that is not conducive to the kind of morale that makes good American citizens and contributes to a return and maintenance of this country's economic welfare and prosperity.

I was hopeful the gentleman from Montana would offer his amendment as I had expected he would, and, in fact, as he had told me he intended to, providing for the full amount of \$6,000,000. The Bureau of Entomology, if you please, is the technical bureau of this Government qualified to pass upon the particular subject we are considering here today. That Bureau recommended somewhat in excess of \$6,000,000 in order to do this job properly. If you do such a job in part, you do not do it at all, in my opinion or in the opinion of those well qualified to pass upon this subject.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the recommendations of the Bureau of Entomology are based partly also upon recommendations which were made by officials of 24 States in which there is grasshopper infestation and in which they outlined the needs of their respective States?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is correct. I have a telegram from our agricultural college and I have the following letter from the Governor of our State, the Honorable John E. Miles:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
Santa Fe, January 17, 1939.

HON. J. J. DEMPSEY,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Recalling the experience that we had last year with the grasshopper situation in some of our counties, and feeling that we will have a similar experience this year, I am wondering if it would be possible to pass a bill in Congress appropriating a certain amount to be used for emergencies of this kind.

I am going to ask that the legislature here set aside a small sum to be used for this purpose, as our financial condition will not permit us to appropriate enough money to conduct the kind of a war that is necessary to destroy the grasshopper menace.

Anything you can do along this line will be appreciated by all concerned.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN E. MILES, Governor.

We have cooperated with the Federal Government in attempting to eliminate this pest, but I am afraid if the committee's recommendation carries here today it will mean that the farmers in certain of our Western States will be forced, unwillingly and by circumstances beyond their control on relief. Instead of coming here asking for \$3,300,000 as we are today, and as the Director of the Budget recommended to this Congress, we are going to have to spend, maybe, \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000 in taking care of people who could take care of themselves if the Federal Government would give them this assistance to which, I think, they are entitled.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman give the members of the Committee a list of the States that are threatened at the present time with grasshoppers, or are already infested, and where the officials of those States have already indicated that grasshopper control methods are necessary?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The list includes the States of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas,

Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not believe it is stating the situation too strongly to say that the grasshopper and other insect pests constitute a greater danger to the Republic than any enemy abroad against whom we are preparing to spend \$1,600,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I quite agree with the gentleman and, frankly, this is a matter affecting the entire Nation, if you please. There is nothing about it that is partisan and there is nothing about it that involves politics. Every farmer in the list of States I have read to you is affected whether he be Democrat, Republican, Communist, Socialist, or what-not.

Mr. KNUTSON. And this involves the welfare of the American people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Positively; and I trust the Committee will vote to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. In fact, I have sent to the desk an amendment increasing this appropriation from \$2,000,000 to \$3,300,000, the figures represented in the amendment of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. I consider not alone the opinion of the Department of Entomology on this subject, but as one of those who have lived in a section of the country that has suffered devastation twice in the last 5 years by the grasshopper infestations, I think I can speak from the experience of myself and others there on the matter of the need of eradicating this pest. We need \$6,000,000, beyond a doubt. This amendment calls for only \$3,300,000, and that, with the amount on hand, would give us approximately \$4,000,000 to combat the plague.

The grasshopper destruction in Wisconsin was something almost unknown until recent years. Twenty years ago I do not suppose there was a farmer in the State who ever had any serious experience with the plague of grasshoppers, but in 1935, following the drought of 1934, thousands of acres of alfalfa, clover, corn, grain, and grass in general were destroyed by the visitation of that year. It is easy to say that the loss to the farmers of the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota ran from twenty-five to thirty million dollars, and perhaps \$40,000,000, just because of the plague in 1935. We had again had a visit from the pests in 1937, following the drought of 1936, and again the devastation was just as extensive.

We cannot say what may happen this year. It depends much upon the weather in April and May as to whether or not we will have another devastating experience, but if we do have it, because we are without this protection, we shall have more millions of losses to the farmers.

The farmers out in that northwest section are now very hard beset. Farm mortgage foreclosures have become so numerous that communities are being changed, transformed, by people leaving their farms following foreclosure proceedings, and going to cities to look for employment. Unless we can protect the farmers still on their farms from the losses which follow such calamities as grasshopper devastation, we shall have more foreclosures and a more important relief problem, and as has been mentioned, we will have more and more farmers moving into the cities for employment, or for work on the W. P. A., or to go upon direct relief.

It seems to me there are other places in which we can economize rather than by cutting down the funds needed for farmers of this Nation for the protection of the food supply of the Nation, for the protection of their crops, and for the protection of that income which will enable them to remain on the farm. I appeal to everyone here to vote for this increase in amount by voting for this amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Would the Government not be helping itself to properly provide protection and for the extermination of these insects, inasmuch as it has the crops insured and would lose money if they are destroyed?

Mr. HULL. In many instances, yes.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. HAWKS. And would not the farmers of our State rather have that type of protection than they would the benefits from the Triple A?

Mr. HULL. Most of them would. In fact, losses suffered by grasshopper invasions in Wisconsin in recent years exceed by far the amount received from the Triple A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, coming from the State which probably had the first experience with Mormon crickets, my purpose in rising at this time is to ask unanimous consent that I may, in an extension of my remarks, include the reason these crickets got their name—that is, Mormon crickets.

The CHAIRMAN. Permission to include extraneous matter must be had in the House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Very well; I shall ask that permission when we get into the House.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. Coming from the State of Utah, I can speak from first-hand experience not only for myself but for the people of my State, dating clear back to 1848, of the destructive and devastating habits of crickets and grasshoppers. When we speak of grasshoppers or crickets or other insects as being capable of destroying millions of dollars in crops, people without experience usually smile. This is usually the reaction of Members of the House without this experience when they are confronted with proposed legislation appropriating large sums of money for the extermination and destruction of crickets, grasshoppers, and other insect pests. I am happy that many sections of the United States are free from this type of crop destruction, but I wish that every Member coming from such a fortunate section could come out to my State and witness just one invasion of Mormon crickets.

It might be of interest to the Members here today, Mr. Chairman, to have me relate to them the story of the first invasion of what are now called Mormon crickets in the State of Utah. The Mormon pioneers, after having been persecuted and driven from pillar to post, from one State to another, for many years, finally determined that their only hope, in order to be able to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience and according to the tenets and teachings of their own faith and religion, was to go to a land so desolate that no other people would want it. It was because of their devotion to and faith in their religion and God that they left their homes in the beautiful city of Nauvoo, Ill., on the banks of the Mississippi River, suffered the hardships and privations of crossing the plains and mountains of western America by ox team and hand cart, and established their homes in a land which had been condemned by the few who knew it as the Great American Desert. They were willing to suffer all of these privations, hardships, and make whatever sacrifices were necessary in order to establish their homes where they would be unmolested and able to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Little did they dream of another menace in the form of insects. They arrived in Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847. After preparing temporary homes, they immediately began to construct ditches and canals for the diversion of waters from the mountain streams flowing into the Great Salt Lake for the irrigation of crops which they began to plant. This was the first irrigation known to the North American Continent. Hundreds and hundreds of acres of winter wheat were put into cultivation. These

early pioneers realized that with the meager provisions they brought with them, their lives depended upon planting and raising crops at the earliest possible time.

When the spring of 1848 came and their winter wheat began to sprout and grow, and other crops planted by them began turning what was a formidable desert into beautiful fields and gardens, they were all happy, contented, and industriously applied themselves to the irrigation and cultivation of their first crop. Their happiness and contentment, however, were soon dispelled and in their place came fear and horror of famine and starvation. They were thousands of miles from nowhere; their only communication with the outside world was by means of ox team. This fear and horror came in the month of May when myriads of destructive crickets rolled in black legions down the mountain sides, and attacked the fields of growing grain. The tender crops fell an easy prey to their fierce voracity. The ground over which they had passed looked as if scorched by fire. Thoroughly alarmed, the community—men, women, and children—marshaled themselves to fight the ravenous foe. Some went through the fields, killing the crickets, but crushing much of the tender grain. Some dug ditches around the farms, turned water into the trenches, and drove and drowned therein the black devourers. Others beat them back with clubs and brooms, or burned them in fires. Still the crickets prevailed. Despite all that could be done by the settlers, their hope of a harvest was fast vanishing, a harvest upon which life itself seemed to depend.

They were rescued, as they believed, by a miracle—a greater miracle than is said to have saved Rome, when the cackling of geese roused the slumbering city in time to beat back the invading Gauls. In the midst of the work of destruction, when it seemed as if nothing could stay it, great flocks of gulls appeared, filling the air with their white wings and plaintive cries. They settled down upon the half-ruined fields. At first it looked as if they had come but to help the crickets destroy. But their real purpose was soon apparent. They came to prey upon the destroyers. All day long they gorged themselves, disgorged, and feasted again, the white gulls upon the black crickets, like hosts of heaven and hell contending, until the pests were vanquished and the people were saved. The birds then returned to their habitat, the Lake islands, leaving the grateful settlers to shed tears of joy over their timely deliverance. A season of scarcity followed, but no fatal famine; and before the worst came, the glad people celebrated, with a public feast, their first harvest home.

The gull is still to be seen in the vicinity of the Great Salt Lake. The wanton killing of these birds was made punishable by law. Rome had her sacred geese; Utah would have her sacred gulls, forever to be held in honor as the heaven-sent messengers that saved the pioneers.

These great old pioneers, being grateful for their deliverance, regardless of the source, and knowing that these sea gulls had saved them probably from famine and starvation, became forever grateful and indebted to them.

Years later, after the pioneering stage in Utah had passed, a monument was erected to the sea gulls by the Mormon people, which monument can be seen now by all visitors to Utah who take time to go to the temple grounds in Salt Lake City. It is my information that this is the only monument in existence built out of respect, honor, and gratitude to a bird or birds.

From this story comes the name of Mormon cricket, which is referred to in this legislation.

I have related it quite in detail, in an effort to impress my colleagues here today with the tremendous, devastating, and destructive force of these insect pests, and hope that whenever you read the name "Mormon cricket" in legislation such as this that in case you are tempted to smile, you reflect on this story of early pioneer life in Utah, and I am sure that, when you do, you cannot help but join the representatives of the Middle West and the West in their plea for relief from such devastation and destruction.

It will probably be pointed out by the gentleman from Virginia in charge of this legislation that the Bureau of



Entomology failed to spend \$700,000 which was appropriated last year. I am informed, and I think the record substantiates this information, that the reason for not spending it is that it came too late. Instead of this, therefore, being an argument against an increased appropriation, it should be an argument in support of it. It certainly indicates that this Bureau of the Government is spending whatever money comes to them wisely and when it can be used most efficiently. The record is replete with testimony justifying the additional amount called for by the amendment of the gentleman from Montana, which would raise the appropriation to the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget. If an insufficient amount is appropriated, it will be too late, a month or so hence, to do much good. It is simply a matter now of spending a sufficient amount to preserve 50 or 60 times that amount in crop values.

I urgently request, Mr. Chairman, support of this amendment. Thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the pending amendment: On page 4, line 8, strike out "\$3,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,417,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to restore the amount asked by the Bureau of Entomology. The \$5,417,000 is the amount, plus \$700,000 carry-over, that would make the amount requested by the Bureau. I am offering this amendment at the suggestion of many Members, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CUMMINGS], and others who have felt we should ask for what the Bureau, which is in charge of this work, thinks is necessary to handle this situation.

I realize that the bill provides \$2,000,000 and that there is a carry-over of \$700,000 which makes a total of \$2,700,000 available which is the total amount appropriated last year. But I call attention to the fact that last year there also was a carry-over so that there was actually obligated and spent \$2,823,000. Of that amount, \$299,514 was spent for handling the fight against the white fringed beetle, with which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] was concerned. So that \$300,000 last year was spent on the white fringed beetle. That was a big increase from \$56,000 for beetles in the previous year. If the beetle is increasing at that rate, then the whole appropriation should be correspondingly increased.

It might appear from the discussion on the floor today that the West is primarily interested in this fight. But the testimony of Dr. Strong in the hearings indicated that there are 24 States in which grasshopper infestations will be serious this year. There are 11 States in which Mormon cricket infestations will be serious. This concerns all of us. The hoppers move.

Another point which should be brought out is the large contribution made by the farmers themselves and the local people in handling this matter. Dr. Strong testified before the committee that \$1,320,853 was provided locally, plus the farmers' labor of handling and distributing the bait, a total estimated to be equivalent to what was spent by the Federal Government.

The reason we need more this year than we needed last year is that the job was not completely done last time. Unless the Federal bureau cleans up the idle and open land the hoppers breed there and fly onto the farmers' fields that have been cleaned up. As has been pointed out, if we can get this money into the hands of the bureau so that at the beginning of the season they can make a comprehensive plan really to clean up on the grasshoppers, then we hope that next year we will not have to come and ask for grasshopper appropriations. If this could be set up now, then we could get our money's worth for what we have spent.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to yield to my new colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I suggest another reason why the Government has greater responsibility this year?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be glad to have the gentleman offer his suggestion.

Mr. MUNDT. I have from the Crop Insurance Corporation the figures covering crop insurance on wheat, by which they are obligated, in case there is a loss in this territory, which seems inevitable unless adequate grasshopper control takes place. They are obligated at the present time, according to estimates received this morning, as follows: In Wyoming, 139,000 bushels; South Dakota, 3,732,000; in Montana, 6,709,000 bushels; North Dakota, 4,659,000 bushels; in Colorado, 1,077,000 bushels; Nebraska, 6,919,000 bushels; Kansas, 8,148,000 bushels; Iowa, 876,000 bushels; or a total of 32,263,000 bushels of liabilities that the Crop Insurance Corporation must pay if the grasshoppers eat up these crops. It seems to me it is not only good insurance but good economy to favor this amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That brings out a point that has not been brought out fully, which is, that in this way the Government can underwrite its own insurance. It is self-protection. It is definitely better to spend this money to prevent crop destruction than to spend it for relief of suffering that comes from loss of crops.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not true that the grasshopper campaign has been largely ineffective in past years because this appropriation has been inadequate and also because it has come too late to do any good?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 65, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR) there were—ayes 74, noes 96.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. O'CONNOR and Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 77, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, Department of Labor—Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Wage and Hour Division in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, contract stenographic reporting services, travel expenses, including not to exceed \$2,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Wage and Hour Division when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, printing and binding, law books, books of reference, periodicals, manuscripts and special reports, newspapers and press clippings, supplies, office equipment, advertising, postage, telephone and telegraph service, reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, fiscal year 1939, \$850,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may allot or transfer, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, funds from this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Labor to enable such agency to perform services for the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso beginning in line 3, page 5, and including the rest of the section on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill that imposes additional duties upon the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

#### CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau: For an additional amount for all authorized and necessary expenses of the Children's Bureau in performing the duties imposed upon it by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; printing and binding; supplies; equipment, newspapers, books of reference, periodicals, and press clippings; and reimbursement to State and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, as authorized by section 11 of said act, fiscal year 1939, \$79,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under the Fair Labor Standards Act when called by the Children's Bureau with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Children's Bureau under said act when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

##### PROCUREMENT DIVISION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS BRANCH

Bureau of the Census Building, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.: For the acquisition of the necessary land and the construction of a building for the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, including the extension of steam and water mains, removal or diversion of such sewers and utilities as may be necessary, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$3,500,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read on the ground it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. To which paragraph does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TABER. I refer to the paragraph just read, entitled "Treasury Department—Procurement Division, Public Buildings Branch."

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the paragraph recites that it depends for authority upon an act approved May 25, 1926, which authorized the construction of public buildings within the District of Columbia.

The funds that have been spent out of the appropriations within the District of Columbia and the limit of cost already fixed thereunder, total \$106,643,416, while the authorization provided in that act for buildings within the District of Columbia is \$50,000,000. The authorization has already been exceeded by \$56,643,416.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] desire to be heard?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not. I think the authority cited in the paragraph to which the point of order is directed is ample authority for the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] say about the increase over the authorization in the original law, referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not know one way or the other, whether the gentleman's statement is accurate or inaccurate. The general statute authorizes the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings in the District of Columbia for governmental purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have before me the statute in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman in reference to that portion which applies to the amount.

Mr. TABER. On page 633 it is provided—

That such amount as is necessary, not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the total amount authorized to be expended under the provisions of this act, shall be available for projects in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is the gentleman quoting verbatim from the act?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does not the citation to which the gentleman calls attention refer to developments in the so-called Triangle? This is not in the Triangle.

Mr. TABER. No. It is the entire authorization.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The general statute itself, as cited in the act, reading it hurriedly, does contain a limitation, but that limitation would seem to apply to certain specifically authorized buildings. In other words, the limitation does not apply to the general authorization for the acquisition of land and the erection of public buildings in the District of Columbia for governmental purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman whether or not there is in that general law a limitation of cost and does this amount exceed that limit as specified in the act?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I said, reading the matter hurriedly, the limit of cost does not appear to fit this particular case.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is reading from the statute which shows a limitation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] says there is no such limitation in the general law. What is he reading from?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am reading from the general law.

Mr. MICHENER. Which print? Is it the Code or is it the statute?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is the statute.

Mr. MICHENER. I think the gentleman understands the purpose of my question. The statute controls. If there is a difference between the statute and the Code, the statute controls. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] states he is reading from the statute.

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. MICHENER. And the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is reading from the Code. If there is a difference, then the statute controls over the Code.

The CHAIRMAN. There is this further question about which the Chair would like information. Assuming that the statute provides for a limit of \$50,000,000, has this been exceeded or not?

Mr. TABER. I have the items covering buildings that have been built in the District of Columbia, which total the figure I gave. I may have left out some items, but I have all the items here.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did the gentleman get his figures?

Mr. TABER. From the Procurement Division.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman that information in documentary form?

Mr. TABER. I have it just as it came over the telephone this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] desire to be heard further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Only to reiterate that in the general law the sum of \$50,000,000 appears to be earmarked for certain buildings. In addition to that, it would appear that general authority is given for the acquisition of land and the erection of public buildings for the Government in the District of Columbia if and when Congress appropriates the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please read that portion of the statute which earmarks the \$50,000,000 for construction within the District?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I shall read from the Code of the Laws of the United States of America, section 341, title XL, under the heading "Acquisition of sites for and construction of public buildings," appearing on page 1793:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide suitable accommodations in the District of Columbia for the executive departments, and independent establishments of the Government not under any executive department, and for courthouses, post offices, immigration stations, customhouses, marine hospitals—



And so forth. When it gets down to the money designation, it states:

*Provided further*, That aside from land that may be acquired for a site for a building for the Supreme Court of the United States, and for enlarging the site of the Government Printing Office, or erecting a storage warehouse or warehouses, the sum of \$50,000,000, hereinafter authorized for projects in the District of Columbia, shall be used exclusively for the purpose of acquiring, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, south of Pennsylvania Avenue and west of Maryland Avenue—

And so forth. In other words, does not the limitation apply to the projects "hereinafter authorized"?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been following the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, but would like to see what the gentleman from New York has to say with respect to whether or not the limitation of \$50,000,000 applies to those buildings that are not included in this census location.

Mr. TABER. It does not apply to buildings such as the Supreme Court Building, the Government Printing Office, and the warehouses, and they are the only ones to which the \$50,000,000 limitation does not apply. The words "not exceeding" are further along in the particular statute from which the gentleman from Virginia has been reading, as I recall. I do not have the book in front of me at the moment, but that is the way I recall it. The gentleman was reading another part of the statute. There are three or four pages of the statute in the book I had.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman believe section 345 of title 40 of the Code places any limitation on section 341, which is the general authorization section of the statute?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it could not unless it specifically repealed that limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The particular question in the mind of the Chair is that the gentleman from Virginia cites a general law that sustains his point, yet the gentleman from New York cites another provision, and the Chair is not fully convinced at the present time that such provision imposes a special limitation. The language in section 345 to which the Chair has reference states:

*Provided*, That such amount as is necessary, not to exceed \$50,000,000, of the total amount authorized to be expended under the provisions of this chapter—

Not "this section" but "this chapter"—

shall be available for projects in the District of Columbia.

That is the particular language cited by the gentleman from New York. It is subsequent to the language cited by the gentleman from Virginia. Does the latter language put a limitation on the first authorization? If it does, the point of order is well taken, provided that amount has been exceeded, and the Chair does not know whether or not it has been exceeded.

What has the gentleman from Virginia to say on this point? Does the gentleman have any information in that regard?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may consider the matter a little more deliberately, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will then be pending, and we shall all have an opportunity to look into the matter.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2868) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader had expressed to me the intention of asking unanimous

consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, so, on his behalf, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia, acting at the request of the majority leader, asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if it is the purpose to continue with this bill when the House convenes on Monday?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that is the purpose, as far as I know.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has anyone on the majority side announced what the program will be for the first part of next week?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There has been some discussion of that. However, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is here now, and I shall refer the gentleman's inquiry to him.

Mr. RAYBURN. There will not be anything the first 3 days of the week except speeches, as far as we know now. I am certain that is true. There will probably be no legislation taken up next week, with the exception of the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks made in Committee this afternoon and include therein various governmental information regarding hurricane and flood damage in Massachusetts and all New England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY, Mr. HEALEY, and Mr. O'CONNOR asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON], which appeared in Collier's magazine under date of January 1, entitled "After Roosevelt, What?"

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how long is the article?

Mr. HALLECK. It is not very long. It will take up a couple of pages in the RECORD.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It will take more than that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 23, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, January 24, 1939. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Commissioner Splawn, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is expected to be the first witness.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Wednesday morning, February 1, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room of the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

299. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for the continuation of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, until January 15, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 118); to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and ordered to be printed.

300. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

301. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to the training, attendance, and participation of the equestrian modern pentathlon teams in the Twelfth Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

302. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands owned by the United States for other lands needed in connection with the expansion of West Point Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

303. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C., with a view to the protection of lands in the vicinity of the lock at Great Bridge against flooding by storm tides, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

304. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 28, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Erie Harbor, Pa., Beach No. 2, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2762. A bill to consolidate and codify the internal-revenue laws of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 318) granting an increase of pension to Emily Semple Wood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 319) granting a pension to William Turner; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 326) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Osterhaus; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 675) granting a pension to Tandy Clark; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 684) granting a pension to Mary E. Brummett; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

A bill (H. R. 1715) to place Harold Staats, formerly captain, Officers' Reserve Corps, on the emergency officers' retired list; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 2217) for the relief of Samuel J. Swain; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 2953. A bill authorizing States owning lands or interests therein acquired from the United States to include the same in certain agreements for the conservation of oil and gas resources; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2954. A bill to limit the use of the frank by former Members of the House and Senate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2955. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station for the study of pests and diseases affecting dark-fired tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska:

H. R. 2956. A bill relating to duty on hams and other pork products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE ROUEN:

H. R. 2957. A bill relative to the disposition of public lands of the United States situated in the State of Oklahoma between the Cimarron base line and the north boundary of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2958. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2959. A bill to add certain lands of the Front Royal Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, Va., to the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2960. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or otherwise dispose of surplus animals inhabiting the national parks and national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2961. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Green Mountain National Park in the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2962. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of land, interests in land, buildings, or other property for the extension of national parks, national monuments, battlefield sites, national military parks, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2963. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 2964. A bill providing for waiver of prosecution by indictment in certain criminal proceedings in the courts of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 2965. A bill to amend section 78 of chapter 231, Thirty-sixth United States Statutes at Large (36 Stat. L., sec. 1109), relating to one judicial district to be known as the district of Idaho, and dividing it into four divisions, to be known as the northern, central, southern, and eastern divisions, defining the territory embraced in said divisions, fixing the terms of district court for said divisions, requiring the clerk of the court to maintain an office in charge of himself or deputy at Coeur d'Alene City, Idaho; Moscow, Idaho; Boise City, Idaho; and Pocatello, Idaho; and to authorize the United States District Court for the District of Idaho, by rule or order, to make such changes in the description or names to conform to such changes of description or names of counties in said divisions as the Legislature of Idaho may hereafter make; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2966. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 20, 1935," approved June 24, 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2967. A bill to grant to the State of California a retrocession of jurisdiction over certain rights-of-way granted to the State of California over a certain road about to be constructed in the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2968. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for control and regulation of public-utility holding companies, and for other purposes," approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2969. A bill to provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical raw materials, concentrates, and alloys essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces and the civilian population in time of a national emergency, and to encourage, as far as possible, the further development of strategic and critical mineral resources in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2970. A bill to repeal and reenact section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended, relating to Federal court districts in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2971. A bill for the relief of certain Indians of the Winnebago Agency; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 2972. A bill to provide honorable discharge status for any veteran who was discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States because of minority or misrepresentation of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2973. A bill to provide for the administration of the United States courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2974. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to provide for the prevention of the spread of disease in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2975. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for aid to States for care of transients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 2976. A bill to extend provisions of an act entitled "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2977. A bill to provide that the widow, and orphans, of any deceased World War veteran who was suffering with a compensable, service-connected disability shall be entitled to pension unless her annual income exceeds \$1,000, or

\$2,500, if she has minor children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2978. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2979. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital and domiciliary facility for the central Pennsylvania area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2980. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2981. A bill amending the Judicial Code in relation to the civil liability of radio broadcasters concerning suits in defamation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2982. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, Canton Island, and Enderbury Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 2983. A bill to provide uniforms and limit subsistence costs to employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2984. A bill to provide for the fixing of working hours and for promotion procedure in the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2985. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 2986. A bill to amend Public, No. 2, March 20, 1933; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2987. A bill providing for the transfusion of blood by members and former members of the Military Establishment, and by employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 2988. A bill to provide for the necessary medical treatment for the service-connected disabilities of World War veterans while abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2989. A bill to prevent the retroactive effect and collection of any Federal tax upon the employees of the several States and the political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2990. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2991. A bill to authorize the establishment of a submarine base adjacent to, and mostly a part of, the Navy reservation at Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, Calif., in connection with the building of "Treasure Island"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2992. A bill to provide for the refund of certain interest paid by veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2993. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (Public, No. 17, 73d Cong.; U. S. C. 1934 edition, title 16, sec. 8311), providing that a portion of the taxes to be paid by the Tennessee Valley Authority on its gross sales of power in the States of Tennessee and Alabama shall be

paid to certain counties in the States of Tennessee and Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to provide for the purchase and sale of timber in the New England hurricane-stricken area; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 3, dated January 9, 1939, with reference to interest rate of 3½ per cent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2994. A bill granting a pension to Lucy Ellen Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 2995. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary N. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2996. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Holly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2997. A bill granting a pension to Christine M. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 2998. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Parr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL:

H. R. 2999. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Triplet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 3000. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Elizabeth Sisson, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 3001. A bill granting an increase of pension to George Bunch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3002. A bill for the relief of Campbell S. Colley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3003. A bill granting a pension to Alma C. Hallead; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRIES:

H. R. 3004. A bill for the relief of Dimitreos Bizos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3005. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Thomas H. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3006. A bill to authorize the award of a decoration for distinguished service, namely, the Congressional Medal of Honor, to Capt. Raphael Lobez; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of Alexander W. Grinsel; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Theo. J. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Raymond Nelson Hickman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3011. A bill granting an increase of pension to Virgil O. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3012. A bill granting a pension to James William Westerfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3013. A bill to set aside the action of general court martial provided under the authority of Special Order No. 233, dated at Manila, P. I., September 22, 1902, insofar as it pertained to cause No. 16, against Pvt. William F. Boyer, Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of William Luther Amnette, Jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3015. A bill for the relief of Isidore Ferzig; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 3016. A bill granting a pension to William Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3017. A bill granting a pension to John Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIERCE of New York:

H. R. 3018. A bill granting an increase of pension to Eunice Dow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 3019. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Dye; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 3020. A bill for the relief of Albert Aloysius Needles; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3021. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Herbert Mell Lowe; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

383. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the members of the Niagara Falls (N. Y.) Fire Department Benefit Club, protesting against any legislation to collect retroactive taxes from employees of the various States, their instrumentalities, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

384. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the lifting of the so-called Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

385. Also, petition of certain citizens of The Dalles, Oreg., having reference to the general policy of neutrality to be pursued by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

386. Also, petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., having reference to the general policy of neutrality to be pursued by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

387. By Mr. BARRY: Resolution of the World War Veterans of Census Local, New York, favoring Government pensions for World War veterans equal to that paid Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

388. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of 25 residents of Philadelphia, favoring adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

389. By Mr. GEYER of California: Resolution of the Workers' Alliance, Local G-219, of San Pedro, Calif. (Helen Musso, secretary), requesting that the matter of building a marine hospital in San Pedro, Calif., be brought before the Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

390. By Mr. HAWKS: Petition of 90 members of Holy Name Society of St. John's Church, Rubicon, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

391. Also, petition of 56 members of St. John's Parish, Rubicon, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

392. By LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Letter and petition of F. R. Ender, of Penelope, Tex., and others, urging the passage of legislation to prohibit speculation and gambling in farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.



393. Also, resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Texas, condemning the present discrimination in freight rates to the people of Texas and the Southwest and requesting the abolition thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

394. By Mr. KEAN: Petition of Mrs. E. Prudence Jamouneau and signed by 70 women citizens of Irvington, Millburn, Maplewood, and Newark, N. J., residents of the Twelfth Congressional District, asking the President and Congress to take every practical means to bring to an end traffic in war materials in the war between China and Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

395. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of St. Joan of Arc's Holy Name Society, Jackson Heights, New York City, concerning the Neutrality Acts of 1935 and 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

396. Also, petition of the Amalgamation of Patriotic Societies, Philadelphia, Pa., concerning the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

397. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of W. L. Snyder and 29 others, respectfully petitioning the Seventy-sixth Congress to enact the improved General Welfare Act, thus relieving the suffering of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and providing prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

398. Also, petition of Mr. Van Oss and 39 others of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and also to retain on our statute books the corollary principle of the same act and to extend the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

399. Also, petition of Dr. Robert J. McGuinness and 16 others, of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and also to retain on our statute books the corollary principle of the same act and to extend the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

400. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Brooklyn Heights Americanization Committee, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

401. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, concerning the Patman bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

402. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 32 citizens of Lancaster, Pa., protesting against any change in our neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

403. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, relating to the national forest and certain revenues pertinent thereto; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

404. Also, resolution of the American Farm Bureau, relating to opposition of the Patman bill, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of certain citizens of Morgan County, Ind., urging the enactment of the general welfare bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

406. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Odessa Commercial Club, of Odessa, Wash., signed by President Reiman and Secretary Galle of that organization, protesting against any extension of the western and southern boundaries of Mount Olympus National Park by Executive order and urging further that no expansion be permitted to occur in any direction which might include mineralized regions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

407. By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio: Petitions of citizens, members of St. Aloysius Church, of East Liverpool, Ohio, and of citizens of Kensington, Summitville, Salem, Lisbon, and Bellaire, Ohio, favoring a policy of strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

408. Also, petition of certain citizens of Bellaire, Shadyside, and Martins Ferry, Ohio, favoring a chain-store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

409. By Mr. MONKIEWICZ: Petitions of certain citizens of Hartford, Middletown, New Canaan, New Britain, and Waterford, Conn., requesting adherence to the general policy of neutrality now in force in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

410. By Mr. O'NEAL: Petition of sundry citizens of Louisville, Ky., favoring consideration in behalf of bills to restore to Congress the power given them by the Constitution of the United States of America to coin and regulate the value of money, as recommended in the Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

411. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Resolution of John W. Bolinger, commander, Kane County Council, the American Legion, Aurora, Ill., requesting the appropriation of \$150,000 for the continuance of the work of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

412. By Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania: Petition of certain citizens of Erie, Pa., favoring the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

413. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of Aloys Holdener, of East St. Louis, Ill., and 27 others, parishioners of St. Philip's Parish, East St. Louis, requesting that Congress adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937, and protesting against lifting the embargo on arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. Also, petition of Cypril P. Voellinger, Belleville, Ill., and 23 others, calling on Congress to maintain the present provisions of the Neutrality Act of May 1938 and urging Congress to oppose any movement to repeal or modify said act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

415. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Jacoby and others, petitioning the Congress to adhere to the Neutrality Act as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and to further adhere to the principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

416. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey State Grange, requesting that the Federal tax on gasoline be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

417. By Mr. TALLE: Memorial of the State of Iowa, petitioning the Congress to pass a law making a 3½-percent interest rate permanent to the farmer borrowers of the Federal land bank and the land bank commissioner, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

418. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry H. Houston 2d Post No. 3, Germantown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Hon. MARTIN DIES' committee; to the Committee on Rules.

419. Also, petition of the American League for Peace and Democracy, Washington Branch, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

420. Also, petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

421. Also, petition of the Civitan Club, Gadsden, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to deportation of all criminal unnaturalized persons; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

422. Also, petition of the Producers' Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning the passing of legislation to extend the operation of title I of the National Housing Act beyond July 1, 1939; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

423. Also, petition of the Ray Current Events Club, Inc., Flushing, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Presidential term of 6 years; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.